

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THANKSGIVING SALUTE TO FARMERS

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a glaring headline recently appeared in one of the Washington, D.C., newspapers which proclaimed that farm prices had soared 5.7 percent.

This reminds me of an article that I saw in one of the west coast newspapers a few months ago. This article was entitled "Thanksgiving Salute to Farmers," and even though Thanksgiving Day is long gone, the substance of the article is nonetheless timely because it points out that the American consumer has a lot for which he has to be thankful wherein the farmer is concerned.

Because the article concerned contains some very important information on the fabulous productive power of the American farmer, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of the consumer:

THANKSGIVING SALUTE TO FARMERS

As the nation pauses tomorrow to enable us to give thanks for the abundance with which we are blessed, the minds of most of us will look back to those long and difficult winters endured by the Pilgrims of Plymouth Colony and their special day of thanksgiving.

Recalling history lessons learned in youth, most Americans figure that Thanksgiving Day has been celebrated in much the same fashion each year since Gov. Bradford proclaimed the first holiday in 1621 in Plymouth Colony. But such is not the case.

Thanksgiving Day as a national holiday was indeed proclaimed more than 150 years later by America's first president, George Washington, but it never flourished to full extent. Again in 1863, President Lincoln reached out in a time of national adversity and revived the Thanksgiving Day custom. Since that time, Thanksgiving Day has indeed been observed regularly, with but a switch of Thursdays.

Yet scholarly studies of history show clearly that "days of thanks" date far back into ancient times. It seems clear that from the time when man first embarked on the tilling of the soil, he has celebrated a "thanksgiving" of sorts to express his gratitude for crops.

For example, it was that early New England statesman Daniel Webster who said, "When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of human civilization." Today's farmers still merit Webster's high praise.

Yet in this age when most Americans live in cities and suburban developments which have boomed where farmlands once prevailed, many people have virtually forgotten where their food supply originates. Too little thought is given to the farmers and the efforts that go into producing the vast supply of top quality foods that are set before us daily.

Foods come pre-cooked, packaged, freeze-dried, frozen, canned and in a multitude of other forms that require special handling after they leave the farm and before they reach the table. But despite all the costly "middleman" work involved in meeting the sophisticated (and often downright lazy) demands of today's consumers, the farmer

still bears the main brunt of "high food price" complaints.

While many persons fondly look back to the "good old days" of lower food costs, too few of them recognize that average incomes have gone up at a faster rate than food costs.

For example, government statistics reveal that in 1940 the pay for an hour's factory work could purchase 1.8 pounds of round steak. Today, the pay for an hour of factory work will buy 2.6 pounds of round steak. In 1940, the pay for an hour of factory work would buy 5.1 quarts of milk. Today, an hour's pay will buy 10.6 quarts.

Despite such examples, many Americans continue to point a condemning finger at the farmer for higher food costs. But even when we grant that prices indeed have gone up, the fact still remains that farmers haven't benefited all that much.

U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show that the farmer has gained a mere 6 per cent increase over prices he received in 1947-49 for food supply farm crops. But in that same period, the retail cost of farm-grown food has soared by 39 per cent and processing and marketing costs have gone up by 71 per cent. Thus, the farmer is not the villain in the cost picture.

Even so, here in America food is still the consumer's biggest bargain. An American family of four persons spends an average 16.5 per cent of its income on food. In Western Europe, the people spend close to 35 per cent of their income on food. In the Soviet Union, food bills use up 55 per cent of the family's income.

The fact is that during the past 25 years, food costs here in America have gone up slower than the costs of almost all other necessities. Retail food costs have increased by 61 per cent in that quarter of a century. But medical costs have gone up a whopping 154 per cent and housing costs have gone up by 81 per cent, to cite just a couple of examples.

Every person engaged in farming in America—from the man who plants the grain to the man who harvests the crop; from the dairy cow owner to the fellow who operates the milking machine—each one produces food for 51 people. That record is worth thinking about.

As such, America's farmers deserve special applause for providing us with many of our reasons for celebrating tomorrow's Thanksgiving Day. The farmers play a major role in our abundance.

CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH ACT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, January 11, I introduced the Children's Dental Health Act which I believe will be a major step toward solving this country's dental care problems. The act authorizes \$50 million to treat low-income and rural children. Nine million dollars is provided to aid communities without sufficient funds in the fluoridation of their water. An additional \$57 million is earmarked for grants to public and nonprofit institutions to train dental auxiliary personnel. Twenty-six million dollars is authorized for studies so that these personnel might be used in the

most effective manner. Finally, the bill would provide for a seven-member Dental Advisory Committee to carefully examine the Nation's dental care programs, and advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Half of America's children at age 2 suffer from tooth decay. Half of the Nation's children have never even seen a dentist. Among low-income children, 70 percent have never been in a dentist's office. The \$4 billion spent annually by Americans for dental care is largely spent to deal with conditions that need not have occurred or might have been arrested much earlier with an effective Federal program of dental care. This bill would provide that sort of program, with preventive, early corrective, and followup care, with cavity reducing fluoridation, and with the expansion of treatment through auxiliary personnel. It is this sort of program that will reduce health care costs in the long run, and provide adequate care for countless Americans now without it.

The bill, originally authored by Senator MAGNUSON, passed the Senate in the last session by a vote of 88 to 1, and is endorsed by major dental organizations. Senator MAGNUSON, as well as Senator KENNEDY who chairs the Subcommittee on Health are to be commended for their fine work.

SISTER CITIES PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by Robert Hardy Andrews concerning the sister cities program, particularly as it relates to Los Angeles and Bombay.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, November 1, 1972]

SISTER CITIES—FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON A "RELATIVE" LEVEL

(By Robert Hardy Andrews)

LOS ANGELES.—This sprawling megalopolis, sometimes described as seven suburbs looking for a city, is also widely known as claimant to the most of almost everything, from number of new settlers to density of smog. Now a new "We're Number 1!" goes on the list.

Within the past few months Los Angeles has adopted four more sister cities. Added to seven already taken into the family, this makes the City of Los Angeles unchallenged *Numero Uno* in the little publicized, good-neighbor campaign that began when President Eisenhower inaugurated the People-to-People program in 1956.

Since then, a low-key effort by private citizens to break down spite fences and build friendships at the ends of the earth, where official ambassadors are not always notably successful, has partnered 390 United States communities with 449 cities and towns in 60 foreign countries.

California leads all states, with 85 sister city affiliations with 117 far-off siblings. Los Angeles alone is partnered with Elath, Israel;

Salvador de Bahia, Brazil; Bordeaux, France; Pusan, South Korea; Berlin, Germany; Nagoya, Japan; Bombay, India; Auckland, N.Z.; Tehran, Iran; Lusaka in Zambia; and Mexico City.

Why are Los Angeles and California so far out in front? Californian modesty restricts reply to pointing out that first overtures came from the other end of the two-way road. Mexico has 53 sister cities in California. Japan has 22. Bombay, 10,000 miles away, chose Los Angeles as most-wanted sister ahead of Leningrad, Stuttgart, and Honolulu.

Responding to this, 400 volunteers formed the Los Angeles-Bombay Sister City Committee, and set about raising \$10,000 to help build a City of Los Angeles High School as a friendship landmark in Bombay. The Bombay side will provide land, labor, and materials to complete a high school for 400 pupils. Forty committee members will go to India this month to present the Los Angeles contribution to neighborliness during observance of the Bombay municipality's centenary.

Said a Bombay editorial: "This is not by any means the only way in which Los Angeles can help. Their city planners can tell us much on how to cope with urban congestion, industrial pollution, rapid-transit systems, and all the problems of a growing metropolis."

Politics brought murmurs that Los Angeles Mayor Samuel Yorty, who has been called "the only American mayor with a foreign policy," favors sister city proliferation because he likes to travel. However City Councilman John Ferraro compared Bombay's growth from two million population in 1947 to six million in 1972, and said "We can probably learn as much from Bombay as they can learn from us."

He explained the operating rules of sister city organizations. They draw no public funds, are incorporated as nonprofit and nonpolitical organizations, are independent of City Hall or Washington officialdom, and work on the simple principle that "with nowhere farther from anywhere any more than 24 hours by air, we're all next-door neighbors, and it's time we got acquainted for our mutual benefit."

A case in point is that of the Pusan Sister City Committee, formed in 1967. Philip Ahn, the veteran Oriental actor in Hollywood films, son of Gen. Chang Ho Ahn, who was called "Korea's George Washington," headed a 40-member Los Angeles delegation, paying its own expenses, that was given a civic reception in Pusan in 1968.

Since then, the Los Angeles-Pusan Committee has raised funds to send needy Korean children to school, collected and sent 5,000 textbooks, furnished musical instruments for Pusan's fledgling symphony orchestra, and brought Korean nurses for training in Los Angeles hospitals. In 1971, 25 percent of South Korea's \$280 million trade with the United States came to Southern California, and largely to Los Angeles.

The Los Angeles-Auckland Committee sent two plane-loads of members, including no public officials, to work out a two-way educational and cultural project. The Los Angeles-Nagoya Committee finances students coming from Japan. The El Elath Committee sends such artists as Zubin Mehta, conductor of the Los Angeles Symphony Orchestra, to give concerts in Israel, with receipts going to Israeli charities.

Charity is not the sister city objective, but in emergencies, the good-neighbor policy applies. The Lusaka Committee finances African students coming to learn how to make artificial limbs, greatly needed in Zambia.

Members of the Bordeaux Committee visited France. In return, 200 visitors, many seeing the U.S. for the first time, were welcomed and entertained in homes in Los Angeles.

Encouragement of foreign travel in the U.S. is a facet of all programs. A 9-mile foot

race in Sydney, Australia, was linked with sister San Francisco. Runners competed for a trip from Down Under, and entered the Bay City's traditional Bay-to-Breakers marathon.

Santa Monica bought a fire engine for Mazatlan in Mexico, sends its high school band to Mazatlan for an annual concert, stages an annual *Fiesta de Santa Monica y Mazatlan* to raise funds for further sisterly collaboration and exchanges teachers and students as guests in private homes.

At base, sister city selection rests on mutual interests, similarity in economic or other characteristics, and historical ties. Planners consult veterans who have served abroad, travelers, foreign consulates, and resident foreign-language groups, and firms with branches in chosen countries. When decision is reached, an invitation goes, proposing exchange of visitors and offering hospitality to those who come.

France has 23 American sister city affiliations. West Germany has 38, Italy 11, Australia 20, Japan 80, Thailand 1 (with Washington, D.C.). On the American side, California's nearest rivals are Michigan, where 27 communities have adopted 36 sister cities overseas, and Florida, where the ratio is 25 to 29. As for municipalities, number 2 is Phoenix, Ariz., sister-tied to Karlsruhe, Germany; Sassari, Italy; Orange, France; Vasteras, Sweden; and Guadalajara, Mexico.

Some choices pair world-apart neighbors that travel agents would be hard put to pinpoint on the map: Tucson, Ariz., with Trikkala, Greece; Miami, Fla., and Me-Ami, Israel; Woodbridge, Conn., with Liguere in Senegal; Independence, Mo., and Blantyre-Limbe, Malawi; Hammononton, N.J., with St. Heller on an English Channel island.

San Clemente, Calif., site of the Western White House, chose San Clemente del Tuyu in Argentina. Small Santa Fe Springs has heartroom for Mersin, Turkey; Navojoa, Mexico; Santa Fe, Argentina. Fresno is partnered with Lahore, Pakistan; Kochi, Japan; and Moulmein, Burma, on Kipling's road to Mandalay.

Name-alikes are popular. Lodi, Calif., chose Lodi, Italy; Cupertino, Calif., picked Italy's Cupertino; Merced, Calif., chose Mercedes in Uruguay.

Artesia, Calif., has the sister with the oddest name: Koudekerk-aan-den-Rijn in the Netherlands.

Whatever inspires selection, the overall record shows that the People-to-People concept is more than rhetoric. In Glendale, Calif., affiliated with Higashiosaka, Japan, special passports are issued, signed by mayors of both cities, given to travelers going or coming as "Your ticket to a friendly home." Monterey Park has put out a decal that blends the California community's Nachi Garden and Nachikatsuura's waterfall in Japan, under the legend *Tomodachi*: "Friend."

The various sister city committees are members of the Town Affiliation Planning Sister Cities Program, headquartered in Washington, D.C., but receive no government or other subsidies. Says Judge Rex Winter, former Santa Monica mayor and City Council member, a leader in the program: "It may not work any miracles, but it's a step in the right direction. There's no 'Ugly American' show-off behavior. In fact, our neighbors overseas seem surprised to find how civilized we are. And it certainly can't hurt for us to learn the same about them."

CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong is a strategy I find unfathomable. I cannot

condone as an instrument of peace the bombing of civilian population centers. As one who has consistently voted for all responsible measures which would have hastened U.S. disengagement from the Vietnam war, and as one who felt that goal was imminent last November, I am at a loss to reconcile the Kissinger pronouncement, "Peace is at hand," with the resumption of intensive bombing.

Intelligence memoranda on the effects of intensive bombing have indicated that far from demoralizing the North Vietnamese, these bombings have steeled their will to continue fighting. To revert to the use of bombing which even the military questions as a method of inducing the North Vietnamese to negotiate, in my judgment demands from the White House a full accounting.

I have written to the White House, requesting that Dr. Kissinger and General Haig present to Congress a detailed explanation of the current state of the peace negotiations, most particularly, points of disagreement with the North Vietnamese that led to the breakdown of the talks. Our Constitution established the Congress as a coequal branch of government. As such, it cannot function without a clear understanding of the issues involved in the peace settlement. How ludicrous that Members of Congress, charged with the responsibility of either approving or disapproving funding and manpower levels for the war, must rely on newspaper accounts of events for information. Such a situation bankrupts the power of Congress to participate in the conduct of foreign policy.

In my judgment, the grievous human toll of our bombing, the American public's shock that this Nation could participate in such an action, and the declining position of the United States as a moral force in world affairs demand that Congress put an end to this war immediately. Therefore, as I have in the past, I will continue to support amendments to cut off military funding for the war and, to prevent another Vietnam from recurring in the future, I will support a strong War Powers Act which would require Congressional approval of any future commitment of U.S. troops.

DOLPHINS END THEIR SUPER SEASON

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to Don Shula and the Miami Dolphins for their superb performance in yesterday's Super Bowl.

This victory over the outstanding Washington Redskins is the crowning glory to the Dolphins' unblemished record this season of 17-0. No other team in the history of professional football has been able to match their phenomenal performance.

I personally wish to thank the Dolphins for the thrills and excitement

which their brand of football has brought to my home State of Florida. In their 7 years in Miami, they have definitely captured the hearts and allegiance of the entire populace and brought great pride to the State of Florida.

Hail to the Dolphins.

MARTIN LUTHER KING: BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today millions throughout America, will in some manner—privately, publicly, or otherwise, observe and pay tribute to a great American, Dr. Martin Luther King, on the 44th anniversary of his birthday. Dr. Martin Luther King was not only a renowned clergyman but a national leader who fought for the principles of peace, justice, and equality for not only all American citizens but for all humanity.

When Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated, the crime did not terminate the great causes for which he was devoting his life, it resulted in an expansive force that has increased immeasurably the success of all the humanitarian principles he espoused. Many Americans who had not been apprised of the humanitarian work which he was advocating became sympathetic and converted to aid in his great program of racial and civic equality for all citizens of our Nation.

By reason of his tragic death, the message he gave at the Lincoln Memorial in the summer of 1963, at which he elaborated on his slogan, "That Great Dream," instilled into the minds of millions the justice of his cause which they can never forget.

When word went out over the Nation of his tragic assassination, the bell tolled for all Americans and for all people everywhere who believed in human justice, dignity, and brotherhood. His great faith in mankind—in the people's capacity to do what was right—sustained this great leader in his crusade for the rights of all our citizens. He had a dream that all men could live as brothers and as he so eloquently expressed led many, including his detractors, to join the cause for equality and civil rights.

He had a deep faith in America, in freedom, and representative government and led millions of his fellow citizens to join in a crusade to follow the principles of the U.S. Constitution that all American citizens must enjoy the rights provided in that great document without discrimination, injustice, and persecution.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that men who fight for these great qualities of equality, liberation, and freedom should meet such a tragic termination of their consecrated work for the goodness of mankind. To mention but a few—Presidents Lincoln and John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Mahatma Gandhi—and many others over the centuries.

THE DEBATE OVER THE RELATIVE POWERS AND PROGRAMS OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate over the relative powers and prerogatives of the President and the Congress—a debate which I believe to be a healthy one if it does not take on a wholly partisan tone—two interesting columns appeared in the Washington Star and Daily News on January 7. Without necessarily subscribing to every punctuation mark and innuendo in either column, I insert in the RECORD the observations of Columnists Crosby S. Noyes and William F. Buckley, Jr., who provide perspectives that differ somewhat from those of the pack:

NIXON KEEPS US GUESSING—AND MAYBE HE SHOULD

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

My friends are all furious about the way that democracy is going to the dogs in this country. A good many of them are paid to know what's going on. And when they can't find out, it gets them very upset about the people who aren't telling them.

You really can't blame them. A good many things are obviously going on that people are interested in, and President Nixon hasn't been willing to give them the time of day. Apart from George Allen, the only person he seems to be talking to these days is Henry Kissinger. And Kissinger is a genius at talking to people at great length without telling them anything that they want to know.

Congress, apparently, feels the same way—sort of left out of things.

Naturally it makes people frustrated and annoyed, and there is a lot of talk going around about how the system is being perverted by one-man rule.

The only trouble is, of course, that the presidency has been the dominant force in the government for close to 200 years now and there isn't very much that Carl Albert or anybody else is likely to be able to do about it. Nixon may be somewhat more secretive than some of our presidents in the past and he doesn't seem to care very much about his relations with Capitol Hill, but he hardly can be accused of inventing the idea of an independent executive.

Come to think of it, quite a lot of things have happened that we weren't much consulted about beforehand. I don't recall being asked, for instance, what I thought about invading Normandy, or dropping an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, or sending troops to Korea, or invading the Bay of Pigs.

It could be that the notion that this country normally operates by a system of unrestricted information, consultation and consensus is something of a myth. Most of our recent presidents, at any rate, have had a way of acting first and consulting afterward in matters of primary importance to the country.

It may be that Nixon is more susceptible to this use—or abuse—of presidential authority, being at the beginning of his last term and therefore less "accountable" to the Congress and public opinion for what he does. One suspects, however, that this supposed nonaccountability is more impressive to the anxious critics of Nixon's policies than it is to the President himself.

Any president, including this one, is ultimately accountable for everything that he does. If his policies fail, no amount of prior consultation and public relations will redeem his reputation and historical standing. If

they succeed, it will probably make very little difference that the country was largely in the dark about what he was up to at the time.

The people's much-asserted "right to know," furthermore, has never been fully subscribed to by any government that ever existed. What the people don't know much of the time is a lot. And quite often there are perfectly valid reasons, aside from the natural furtiveness of chief executives, that make it imperative to leave them in ignorance.

Something of the sort may be the case today. What everybody is so worked up about, of course, are the negotiations on Vietnam and the chances of reaching a settlement of the war in the near future. Among other things, they want to know whether and why it was necessary to bomb the hell out of Hanoi and Haiphong at such a high cost in lives and public anguish. They are asking what or who it was that blocked the settlement that Kissinger said was at hand and what the real prospects are today.

The questions are pertinent and so, perhaps, are the reasons for not answering them. The most detailed knowledge by the public and the Congress on the state of the negotiations probably would not bring a settlement nearer. And indeed, it might foreclose the possibility of arriving at any settlement at all.

It is hard to ask people to live with their frustrations and their ignorance, but for the time being it may be necessary. Because the simple fact is that Nixon and Kissinger are not negotiating with the White House press corps or the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but with the North Vietnamese.

Everything that has been said and left unsaid so far is a part of that negotiation. Until it is concluded, the President has the right—and perhaps the duty—to keep the country guessing.

WHY SHOULD NOT THE PRESIDENT REMAIN ALOOF?

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

On the whole, it is sensible to take the side of Congress against the Executive, up until you come close to spilling over into the kind of chaos mercifully ended by Charles de Gaulle when he filled up the great cavities of the Fourth Republic. We are not near to that kind of anarchy in the United States, and it is therefore the operative presumption that the White House has entirely too much power.

That said, one makes the distinction. The Congress of the United States has luxuriated in hypocrisy for a very long time.

On the one hand it resents characteristic executive usurpation, on the other hand it (a) does nothing about it; and (b) is always there strengthening the hand of the executive.

The typical bill passed nowadays by Congress gives the President the power to invoke or not to invoke this or that measure; gives him the responsibility for naming the members of this or the other board; passes sense-of-the-Congress resolutions while ignoring the simpler remedy of decreeing how things shall be.

And of course in matters economic, it is particularly fond of passing lazy inflationary bills and expecting the President to veto them; or, if he fails to do so, contriving somehow to blame the President for the inflation that ensues.

The focus of Congressional resentment, at this writing, is the recent bombing of North Vietnam, and the refusal of Mr. Rogers and Mr. Kissinger to appear before a Senate committee to "explain" the President's decision. All kinds of things are being deduced from the President's recent reclusiveness, but a few critical observations are usually left unmade, to wit:

(1) A president who plays with the press, as kittenishly as FDR or JFK, is potentially more dangerous than the President who is

aloof from the press. Better that the press should be presumptively skeptical of presidential operations—than that it should treat the President unctuously, in reaction to his charm or openhandedness.

(2) What is it expected that Mr. Nixon could have said to the press to explain his decision to proceed with the bombing?

"Mr. President, do you really believe that the carpet bombing of North Vietnam is going to bring Hanoi to the negotiating table with further concessions?"

How would Mr. Nixon have answered that question responsibly?

If he had said that he did believe the bombing would work, he'd have strengthened North Vietnamese resolution to resist the pressure of the bombing.

If he had said that he did not believe the bombing would work, he'd have raised the question why he had resorted to it.

If he had said that he did not know whether the bombing would work, he'd have said in effect that he was indulging a petulance.

(3) But if he had looked calmly at his tormentors and said: "*Nemo me impune lacessit*," and walked back into the Oval Room, why he'd have been arrested moments later as the murderer in cold blood of Tom Wicker and Anthony Lewis. There are things you simply don't say: even though you give them expression.

"No man who trifles with me does so with impunity." That is the national motto of Scotland, and it is a maxim appropriate not to Dr. Strangelove, but to Aristides. It is a personalization of the rules of good international behavior which support the peace. But it is uncouth to invoke such truisms, in mid-discipline: and the wise ruler will avoid the temptation to sin, even rhetorically.

It is altogether obvious what Richard Nixon is up to. Those who disagree with his decision are perfectly free to do so. Why should he give them a more elaborate scaffold on which to hang him? He is right, at this moment, to be silent. Who wants a chatty executioner?

MILITARY RETIREES DESERVE BETTER

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 years, America's retired military men and women have suffered from an unjust system of computing their retirement pay that leaves them the victims of an ever-soaring cost of living.

Prior to 1958, their retirement pay was recomputed to keep pace with increases in the pay of military personnel on active duty. However, Congress abandoned this plan in favor of one that supposedly was tied to increases in the cost of living.

It simply has not worked out. The cost of living has soared, yet the retirement pay has not kept pace and the gap between active duty and retirement pay has grown wider and wider.

Like many others trying to live on a fixed income, our retired military personnel have been hard hit by inflation. Many live in my own Sixth Congressional District of Florida, and I can personally attest to the hardship they are forced to undergo. Our military retirees, who have devoted many, many years of service to their country, often at great personal

sacrifice, are now being forced, along with their families, to live a very marginal existence.

For this reason, as one of my first acts with the opening of the new 93d Congress, I introduced H.R. 221, the Uniformed Services Retirement Pay Equalization Act, which calls for a return to the former program of equalizing retirement pay with the pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service.

This policy had been followed for more than 90 years, and many people entered the service confident in the belief that the law would be followed and their pay upon retirement would be adjusted to keep pace with the pay of our active forces. I personally feel it was a breach of faith to change this system and tie retirement pay to the cost of living.

Two years ago, I introduced a bill to return to the former recomputation system; while approved as an amendment in the Senate, the measure, unfortunately, was not accepted by the conference committee.

I hope the Congress will promptly adopt my new bill, thus giving deserved recognition to the men and women who served their country so gallantly over the years. The Congress, and a grateful Nation, owe them no less.

FROM BAD TO WORSE

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, mail service in the United States is the worst I have seen in my lifetime. I daresay it is the worst the Nation has known since the railroads knit our country together.

The mail is not going through—at least not on a timely basis. I am sure that every Member of this body has his own collection of horror stories about the slowness and unreliability of mail service. It is not unusual for regular first class mail from my district in south Texas to reach my office a week or 10 days after it was dispatched. Even the use of airmail does not guarantee fast delivery. The special delivery system is a farce.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for a moment that the House of Representatives, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and definitely this Member, ever intended that the Postal Reorganization Act, which created the U.S. Postal Service, should destroy mail service in the United States. But that is the direction in which we are going.

We were promised much, but the promises have not been fulfilled. I believe it is time to concede that a mistake was made in the creation of the U.S. Postal Service. And it is time, in my opinion, to rectify that mistake. What we have now is far inferior to what we used to have. And, no one is happy—none is getting what was promised—not the post office employees, not the patrons.

For these reasons, I am introducing today legislation to abolish the U.S. Postal Service by repealing the Postal Reorganization Act and to reestablish the U.S. Post Office Department as an executive department of the Federal Government. I offer this measure as a vehicle which will enable the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to start all over in establishing the kind of modern, efficient postal system that the American people want and which they are entitled to have.

The state of the present mail service is a matter of serious concern to almost every individual in the United States. This body has a responsibility to improve it. Abolition of the U.S. Postal Service is a necessary first step in that direction. I hope we will take it.

HOUSE SADDENED BY LOSS OF DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress has opened without several familiar persons. All of us are particularly saddened by the loss of three distinguished Members.

In October, Congressmen Nick Begich of Alaska and Hale Boggs of Louisiana disappeared during the course of an air flight over Alaska, while Mr. Boggs was campaigning for the reelection of Mr. Begich. To date, no trace of them, their pilot, or their aircraft has been found.

In December, Representative George Collins of Illinois was one of many people killed in the tragic crash of a commercial airliner in Chicago.

These three men, from different districts and States, held a common respect for the national legislature and for the good of the people of their home district.

George Collins traveled to his district on Chicago's West Side almost every weekend as his way of keeping in close touch with those he represented. He was a tireless champion of the rights of all Americans, and the Seventh District of Illinois has indeed lost a good friend and public servant.

When Hale Boggs came to the House of Representatives in 1941, he was just 26 years of age, the youngest man in Congress. In the long and eventful years since he first came to Washington, he has risen to positions of authority in the various committees and forums of the House. As majority leader, Hale Boggs provided the leadership for his party, and he served the people of Louisiana well.

Nick Begich came to the House 2 years ago as Alaska's Representative-at-Large. He quickly moved to take on many issues confronting the Congress, and served ably on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. His knowledge of Indian affairs, national parks, and public lands has been of great value to his colleagues.

These men are certainly going to be missed by the 93d Congress. I know I speak for all my colleagues in extending our deepest sympathies to their families.

BETTER WAYS TO CUT USDA BUDGET

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, upon announcement of the termination of the REAP and water bank programs, the suspension of direct 2-percent loans under the Rural Electrification Administration, and the termination of the emergency \$5,000 forgiveness loans in case of disaster, I sent the following letter to Secretary Earl Butz:

The Honorable EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In a letter today to Chairman W. R. Poage of the Committee on Agriculture I have requested early hearings to examine the scope and effect of recent decisions of the Administration which curtail rural emergency loans, terminate activities under REAP and Water Bank Programs, suspend direct 2 percent loans under the Rural Electrification Act, and extend guaranteed and insured loans to cooperative electric and telephone companies under the Rural Development Act of 1972. I enclose a copy of my letter.

I recognize the necessity for the Administration to find ways to reduce the expenditure level of the Federal government during the current fiscal year, and I applaud all reasonable steps to that end. I also believe that Congress, in its appalling lack of self-discipline in budget management, must bear a heavy burden of guilt for the imbalance in receipts and expenditures which impels the Administration to this search.

The problem confronting the Administration is, of course, complicated by the fact that most expenditures are mandated by Congress. Among those not mandated are those rural programs the Administration has just terminated or curtailed.

Hearings, I feel, will be helpful to all concerned, and I am confident you and your aides will welcome this means to add to public understanding.

Additionally, I would like to add a few comments and suggestions.

I respectfully urge that you carefully re-examine the steps taken to assure that they do not impair essential services in rural areas and programs vital to environmental protection.

In an understandable zeal to clean up the Federal budget problem, we must be careful not to throw out the baby with the bath water.

For example, will the actions taken sharply reduce funds available to employ Soil Conservation Service specialists? Will they lead to increased soil erosion with consequent damage to water supplies? Will they seriously cripple rural electric cooperatives in their vital program to meet the rising electric power requirements of modern agriculture? Will they harm the private financing initiative already undertaken by the cooperatives?

In addition, I strongly urge that you broaden your search for better ways to cut the USDA budget.

In that regard, I hope you will reduce the annual limitation on payments to individual farmers under the cotton and feed grains programs from the present \$55,000 level to \$20,000. It is too late for wheat, but not too late for cotton and feed grains. Present law clearly gives you this opportunity and authority. I estimate the savings, assuming tight administration, will exceed \$200 million.

These payments are disbursed essentially in exchange for agreements not to produce

crops. They are largely income support for farm families and yield nothing in the way of environmental protection or other public benefit. In fact, this year cotton growers need not even idle a square inch of land in order to be eligible for payments.

Cutting back on funds to hire Soil Conservation Service technicians, and to build grass waterways and water impoundments of course reduces programs which have direct and lasting public benefit because they serve to protect and improve our environment. Cutting out REA subsidies may handicap certain deserving electric cooperatives in establishing and improving modern service to remote farms.

Present law establishes the limitation at "shall not exceed \$55,000" a year. This leaves the Administration with the option to reduce the limitation. If, as I recommend, it is dropped to \$20,000 per farm and administered tightly so as to discourage evasion, this change alone would reduce budget costs \$200 million.

You can also reduce outlay this year \$10 million simply by exercising the option—an option clearly extended to you by a ruling of the Comptroller General—not to provide further funding under Section 610 of the Agricultural Act of 1970 to Cotton, Incorporated, a research and advertising firm whose effectiveness is questionable to say the least.

These two suggested actions present obvious advantages over actions you have just taken.

I hope these comments and suggestions will be helpful.

Sincerely,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

DISTINGUISHED BANK PRESIDENT RETIRES

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, my friend Russell A. Blanchard, one of Georgia's most respected bankers and citizens, has recently retired as president of the Georgia Railroad Bank & Trust Co. of Augusta.

Mr. Blanchard began his long and distinguished career with the Georgia Railroad Bank & Trust Co. in 1927 as a clerk in the bookkeeping department and, after serving in every department of the bank, became President in 1969. Through the years, he has devoted equal energy and unselfish service to the numerous civic affairs and church activities in which he has been involved.

In recognition of Russell Blanchard's many contributions to Augusta and Georgia, I would like to share with my colleagues the following editorial tribute which was printed in the Augusta Chronicle on December 28, 1972:

DISTINGUISHED CAREER

The retirement of Russell A. Blanchard as vice chairman of the board of the Georgia Railroad Bank and Trust Co. marks the completion of a distinguished career in the financial life of the community, the state and the Nation.

Mr. Blanchard has served in every department of the bank, and assumed its presidency in 1969. His entire business life was with this institution, his first job in 1927 being with the bank as a clerk in the bookkeeping department.

His stature in his business field has been recognized, however, far beyond the bounds

of the city or the area. He was elected president of the Georgia Bankers Association in 1960. He was elected in 1967 as president of the State Bank Division of the American Bankers Association. In addition, he has served in numerous other responsible posts in both of those organizations, and on boards of directors of various banking and business firms. An outstanding aspect of his professional work is his service as the director of the annual Georgia Banking School at Athens, sponsored by the Georgia Bankers Association.

It is, of course, in non-business capacities that he has rendered much of his service. He has held positions of responsibility with the United Fund and as president of its predecessor, the Character Chest of Augusta; on the board of directors of the Tuttle-Newton Home; and as secretary of the board of trustees of the North Augusta schools. In recent years, one of the most effective means of civic service has been his dedicated work as chairman of the board of trustees of the Augusta College Foundation.

He has been no less devoted to his church. He has served on the board of deacons of the First Baptist Church, and as a trustee of the Georgia Baptist Foundation.

Mr. Blanchard's contributions to his fellow man in all fields of endeavor are marked by wholehearted commitment, sound judgment and outstanding ability. We trust that even though his business activities have reached this milestone, he will have many more years with us as a valued and appreciated community leader.

BILL TO REQUIRE CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL WHEN FEDERAL FUNDS ARE IMPOUNDED BY EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined with several of my colleagues in introducing legislation to require congressional approval when Federal funds are impounded by the Executive department.

This measure is designed to return the power of the purse to the Congress, where it rightfully belongs.

Our national priorities are being dictated by the Executive branch through the assumption of negative funding powers. There can be doubt as to what comes first on the list of priorities. In fiscal year 1973, the budget for the Department of Defense was increased by \$3.32 billion over fiscal year 1972, to an all new high of \$74.37 billion, despite the SALT agreements and the so-called winding down of the war in Vietnam.

On the other side of the coin, there can be no doubt as to what comes last: \$107 million was impounded from the Rural Electrification Administration, \$58 million from the water and sewer grants program of the Department of Agriculture, \$500 million from the water and sewer grants program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and half of the \$25 billion appropriated by Congress to carry out the Water Pollution Control Act of 1972.

The Congress must deal with this issue at the outset, lest the legislative work that we accomplish and the national priorities which we set during these next 2 years are preempted by Executive fiat.

TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE HONORS CUMMINGS

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last week in an unprecedented move, the Tennessee General Assembly convened outside of the State capitol to honor Mr. Jim Cummings, who was known as the dean of the legislature until his retirement last year. The purpose of the meeting was to name a dormitory at Middle Tennessee State University in honor of Mr. Cummings.

The occasion was announced in a story by Kirk Loggins in the Nashville Tennessean on January 7, 1973. As one who has known and respected Mr. Cummings for many years, having served with him in Gov. Gordon Browning's cabinet, I include the article from the Tennessean to be placed in the RECORD at this point:

ASSEMBLY SETS HISTORIC MOVE FOR

"MR. JIM"

(By Kirk Loggins)

MURFREESBORO.—The General Assembly will convene here Wednesday for the first time since 1825, when the state capital was moved to Nashville, to honor James H. (Mr. Jim) Cummings of Woodbury, longtime dean of the legislature.

The House and Senate will be called into session at 4:30 p.m. in the Dramatic Arts Auditorium at Middle Tennessee State University for the naming of a seven-story women's dormitory in honor of Cummings, 82, who retired last year after representing neighboring Cannon County for 36 years!

Gov. Winfield Dunn will participate in the ceremonies, unveiling a portrait of "Mr. Jim," which will be placed in the lobby of the building bearing his name, and Rep. John Bragg of Murfreesboro will give the dedicatory address.

The General Assembly will meet in another joint session at noon Thursday, at the Capitol, to hear Gov. Dunn deliver his annual budget message.

"The meeting of the legislature here Wednesday will be a historic occasion, and I don't think it could take place for a better reason than the honoring of Mr. Jim," Rep. Bragg, chairman of a special MTSU committee in charge of arrangements for the occasion, said yesterday.

"During the Depression, Mr. Jim led a drive to raise about \$60,000 each for the state teachers colleges here and in Memphis, Cookeville, and Johnson City, and that's what saved these universities," Bragg said.

The resolution to be considered by the Assembly here Wednesday also honors Mrs. Cummings, who was her husband's secretary until recently.

"Without her looking after all of his law clients back in Woodbury, he couldn't have been gone from the office that long," Bragg said, adding that Cummings referred to "Miss Hesta" as the "speaker of my house."

Members of the legislature will board National Guard buses at the Motlow Tunnel, in front of the Capitol in Nashville, at 3:15 p.m. Wednesday for the ceremonies here, which are open to the public.

Dr. M. G. Scarlett, MTSU president, Dr. Howard Kirksey, vice president for academic affairs, and John Jackson, Associated Student Body president, will represent the university at the dedication, and Mr. Cummings' secretary, Mrs. Linda Brown, State Treasurer Tommy Wiseman and Bob Abernathy, former director of university relations at MTSU, will speak briefly on their memories of "Mr. Jim."

Following the afternoon ceremonies, members of the General Assembly and the honor guests will be guests of the university at a buffet dinner and a basketball game with MacMurray College of Illinois, in the new Charles Murphy Convocation Center.

Murfreesboro was capital of the state from 1819 to 1825, and the General Assembly voted in Nashville in 1839 to make it the center of state government again, but the move failed when the House refused to appropriate the necessary funds to transfer state records here from Nashville.

"I personally give James K. Polk (then governor and later President) a lot of the credit for keeping the capital in Nashville, since he said he wouldn't move to Murfreesboro," Bragg said.

Nashville became capital in 1826 and was made the permanent capital in 1843. The other locations were: Knoxville, 1796-1806; Kingston, for one day only, 1807; Knoxville, 1808-1811; Nashville, 1812-1815, and Knoxville, 1816-1817.

Following the destruction by fire of the old Rutherford County Courthouse, its meeting place, the General Assembly met in a Presbyterian church here, according to Bragg. One of the highlights of the legislature's stay in Murfreesboro was a ceremony honoring Gen. Andrew Jackson for his military victories.

In addition to his 14 terms in the House and two in the Senate, Cummings a Democrat, served as secretary of state from 1949 to 1953 and was elected speaker of the House in 1967. Born on Cannon County farm in 1890, he began his political career as Cannon County circuit court clerk in 1912 and was first elected to the Tennessee House of Representatives in 1928.

REMARKS ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 163

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago on February 3, the troop transport *Dorchester* was torpedoed and sunk in the icy North Atlantic waters off the coast of Greenland.

Aboard that ship were more than 600 servicemen and four chaplains—a rabbi, a priest and two Protestant ministers. Disregarding their own safety, the chaplains gave up their lifejackets to soldiers who had lost theirs and in so doing gave up their own lives so that others might live.

As they died, they stood hand in hand praying to God for the safety of those who were fleeing the sinking ship.

This selfless act is reflective of the dedication to God and humanity which clergymen of all faiths display every day throughout this Nation.

For more than 10 years, Mr. Speaker, Civitan International has sponsored programs in communities across the country in recognition of the dedication of members of the clergy through its International Clergy Week observance.

Again this year, activities are being planned throughout the Nation, highlighted by a week long series of programs in Albuquerque, N. Mex.

In appreciation of the services to mankind by the clergy, President Nixon in 1970 proclaimed the week including Feb-

ruary 3 as International Clergy Week in the United States.

In support of continuing the recognition by the United States of this dedication, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 163 which would authorize and direct the President to proclaim the week beginning January 28 as International Clergy Week.

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE, AGAIN?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one problem facing our country for which we must find a solution is the building of manufacturing plants in foreign countries by American industry and the resulting exporting of jobs.

I would like, with your permission, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial written by Gordon Duenow in the St. Cloud Daily Times in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Editor Duenow very aptly points out the need to come to grips with this problem if we hope for a happy economic outlook for 1973:

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE AGAIN?

Elsewhere on this editorial page today, Hobart Rowen, columnist for the Washington Post, comments that the "U.S. economy is winding up the year with a great burst of strength." He points out, however, that "despite the happy outlook for 1973, mitigated by unemployment levels that are still too high for blacks and young persons, there are pressing questions of economic policy that the administration is now trying to answer."

Wage and price controls, inflation and assistance to industries and workers suffering hardship as a consequence of heavy imports were mentioned as examples.

While many of us have some realization of what is taking place involving imports and consequent loss of jobs for U.S. workers, the extent of what is taking place is only slowly being revealed.

For instance, in his weekly newsletter, Rep. John Zwach points out that in the past year 57 American manufacturers have opened new plants in Mexico where there are now 350 such new factories.

This may sound bad enough, but, according to Zwach's newsletter, while manufacturers bring their machinery and raw materials from the United States to Mexico, none of the products produced by them can be sold in Mexico where they might compete with local products. Wonder how many countries have plants in the United States where a similar situation exists?

Most of the products manufactured by U.S. plants in Mexico eventually wind up in the United States where many of them are imported duty-free. So far, Zwach writes, these companies provide employment for about 50,000 Mexican workers.

This hasn't only been taking place in Mexico, either. It's been happening all over the world where American industry is taking advantage of cheap labor.

The Nixon administration is aware of what is going on but, as Rowen writes in his column today, it is about to ditch its own plan to recommend an expenditure of \$500 million for "adjustment assistance" to industries and workers suffering hardship as a consequence of heavy imports. Reason given is the effort to control federal spending to conform with limits set down by Nixon.

It is possible that we maybe are being "penny wise and pound foolish" in this instance. If the serious problem which already exists gets any worse it may take a huge appropriation and strong measures to curb a situation which may get entirely out of control. It has happened before in the history of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY TRUMAN

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the passing of former President Harry Truman was truly a great loss to all Americans, and I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to his memory.

He was one of those public figures whose reputations flourish only after many years of retirement. All the things that, at first, made him seem too small for the office he held dwindled in importance with the passing of decades. What loomed larger than these relative trivialities was a sense of the man's courage—a realization that he faced and made more great decisions than most other American Presidents before and after him.

When catapulted into the White House by the death of Franklin Roosevelt in 1945, he was challenged by some of the most critical moments in our history. He responded to them with conviction and determination, often making awesome decisions that aroused the ire of the American press and public. But, driven by an inner sense of confidence that was neither proud or ashamed, he acted resolutely and irrevocably. When confronted by the great issues, Harry Truman never flinched. And right or wrong, he never made a decision that he did not feel was in the best interests of the country.

It was his wish that there would be no hymns or eulogies at his funeral, but I think that Truman himself made the best assessment of his life and career. When asked to select one statement to sum up his life in politics, he chose a speech he had made in North Carolina during the 1948 campaign. Its moral is typical of him.

In that speech he discussed three southerners who became Presidents of the United States—Andrew Jackson, James Polk, and Andrew Johnson. All of them, he said:

Lived through days when reason was overcome by emotion and because of this their actions were misunderstood and misinterpreted. So it is not surprising that the estimates of these men made by their contemporaries have been almost completely discarded by later generations.

Of these estimations, he added:

A President may dismiss the abuse of scoundrels, but to be denounced by honest men honestly outraged is a test of greatness that none but the strongest men can survive.

There was, he concluded, only one lesson to be drawn from the story of these three Presidents:

Do your duty and history will do you justice.

His assertion is true.

OCCUPATION OF SOUTH VIETNAM: A NON-NEGOTIABLE ISSUE AT THE PEACE TALKS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently pointed out that the primary objective of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam was to insure the territorial integrity of South Vietnam as a separate and distinct nation from North Vietnam. The territorial integrity of South Vietnam remains a nonnegotiable issue at the Paris peace talks.

If the North Vietnam Communists truly want peace, why do they insist on occupying or having free access to areas south of the demilitarized zone which they gained through armed aggression?

A well-documented paper by Dr. Nguyen Tien Hung, a native of Vietnam and associate professor of economics at Howard University, supports this position.

I ask that the paper prepared by Dr. Hung entitled "The Central Issue at the Peace Negotiations" be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The paper follows:

THE CENTRAL ISSUE AT THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

(By Nguyen Tien Hung)

One of the thorniest issues which still remain to be settled before and after the declaration of a cease-fire is the question of withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops from the rest of Indochina.

In his December 16 news conference, Presidential Advisor, Henry Kissinger said, "In particular, the United States' position with respect to the cease-fire had been made clear in October 1970. It had been reiterated in the President's proposal of January 25, 1972. It was repeated again in the President's proposal of May 8, 1972. None of these proposals had asked for a withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces. Therefore, we could not agree with our allies in South Vietnam when they added conditions to the established positions after an agreement had been reached that reflected these established positions."

However, a thorough analysis of peace proposals over the past four years suggests that, contrary to Dr. Kissinger's statement, the United States' established position has consistently been that all outside forces, including the North Vietnamese, must depart from South Vietnam as part of a final settlement.

MAY 14, 1969, PROPOSAL

The allies' "essential principles" on negotiation, spelled out in detail by President Nixon in his May 14, 1969, proposal and which Dr. Kissinger failed to mention in his news conference, clearly stipulate the withdrawal of Hanoi's forces. Four months after taking office, President Nixon declared in his first proposal for peace: "We have ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield."

"We have also ruled out either a one-sided withdrawal from Viet-Nam or the acceptance in Paris of terms that would amount to a disguised defeat."

In the same address, Mr. Nixon set forth a single and most essential objective of American involvement in the war; that is, "the opportunity for the South Vietnamese to determine their own political future without outside interference. He went on to state: "To implement these principles, I reaffirm now our willingness to withdraw our forces on a specified timetable. We ask only that North Vietnam withdraw its forces from South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos into North Vietnam, also in accordance with a timetable." The President summarized his proposal this way, "This, then, is the outline of the settlement that we seek to negotiate in Paris. Its basic terms are very simple: mutual withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam and free choice for the people of South Vietnam. I believe that the long-term interests of peace require that we insist on no less and that the realities of the situation require that we seek no more." He indicated that the proposals were made on the basis of full consultation with President Thieu.

The allies' established position on withdrawal was reiterated at the Midway Island meeting on June 8, 1969, between President Nixon and South Vietnamese President Thieu. The joint statement reported "They [the two Presidents] reiterated in particular the allied position concerning mutual withdrawals of non-South Vietnamese forces, agreeing that withdrawals could commence simultaneously and proceed expeditiously on the basis of a mutually acceptable timetable; that all externally introduced forces would have to be withdrawn not only from South Vietnam but also from Laos and Cambodia; and that the further introduction of forces into these countries must be prohibited. They agreed that the essential element of any arrangement on withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces is that there be adequate assurances and guarantees of compliance with the terms of the arrangement."

President Nixon reaffirmed his stand again a few months later in a television address to the nation from San Clemente on April 20, 1970. He said, "I again reaffirm this Government's acceptance of eventual total withdrawal of American troops. In turn, we must see the permanent withdrawal of all North Vietnamese troops and be given reasonable assurances that they will not return."

It seems relevant here to see whether or not the United States' position on the cease-fire as disclosed October 7, 1970, actually deviated from its original position.

OCTOBER 7, 1970, PROPOSAL

After the Cambodian operation in April 1970, President Nixon presented "a major new initiative for peace" on October 7, 1970. Dr. Kissinger took this proposal as a starting point for the U.S. position on the cease-fire during his December 16, 1972, press conference. He said that this position was reiterated on January 25, 1972, and May 8, 1972. Because of the emphasis which is placed on the October 7, 1970, proposal, a close scrutiny of its most important features is warranted.

In this address, President Nixon said: First, I propose that all armed forces throughout Indochina cease firing their weapons and remain in the positions they now hold. This would be a 'cease-fire in place.' It would not in itself be an end to the conflict, but it would accomplish one goal all of us have been working toward: an end to the killing." Other components of the plan included a broadened Indochina peace conference, an agreed timetable for complete troop withdrawals, a political settlement that truly met the aspirations of all South

Vietnam, and the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war. Regarding the cease-fire, the general principles to be applied were that the cease-fire must be effectively supervised by international observers, as well as by the parties themselves; it should not be the means by which either side builds up its strength; it should cause all kinds of warfare to stop; it should encompass all Indochina; and it should be part of a general move to end the war in Indochina.

Although there was no specific requirement for withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces in this proposal, it can be argued that the allies' original principle of "mutual" withdrawal as outlined in the May 14, 1969, proposal remained unchanged. The reason is that, in the October 1970 address, the President declared, "We are prepared to withdraw all our forces as part of a settlement based on the principles I spelled out previously and the proposals I am making tonight." That the previous principles the President referred to include the mutuality of withdrawal is beyond the shadow of a doubt. In fact, one day after his address to the nation on October 7, 1970, Mr. Nixon explained to the press at Skidaway Island (White House Press Release October 8, 1970) the U.S. position: "We made this proposal because we want to cover every base that we could. That is why we offered the cease-fire, a total cease-fire. That is why we offered a total withdrawal of all of our forces, something we have never offered before, if we had mutual withdrawal on the other side."

Thereafter, the President also reiterated the United States' position on several occasions. At a news conference on February 17, 1971, in reply to a question about whether he was willing to join with Congress in a resolution to state American intention to withdraw all troops from South Vietnam, the President said, "[the resolution is] Not needed, because you see, in my October speech, as you will recall, I called for a cease-fire, I called for a political settlement, and I also called for a total withdrawal of all forces if it was mutual. So the policy of this Government is for a total withdrawal, provided there is a withdrawal by the other side."

Less than three weeks later, in another news conference on March 4, 1971, he said, "... our goal is a complete American withdrawal from Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam. As you know, that is the proposal I made on October 7. I made it, however, on a mutual basis—that we would withdraw but that the North Vietnamese would withdraw at the same time."

In another major television address on April 7, 1971, six months after the October proposal, President Nixon again reaffirmed this position: "I am sure most of you will recall that on October 7 of last year in a national TV broadcast, I proposed an immediate cease-fire throughout Indochina, the immediate release of all prisoners of war in the Indochina area, an all-Indochina peace conference, the complete withdrawal of all outside forces, and a political settlement." It can be concluded firmly, therefore, that both the October 7 and April 7 speeches include the "mutuality" aspect of troop withdrawal. This point was again recalled by the President in his April 29, 1971, news conference: "We have set forth both in my speech of October 7 and then on April 7 a complete American proposal for negotiation ... Those proposals include a cease-fire; they include an exchange of prisoners; they include, as you know, a mutual withdrawal of forces and an Indochina peace conference."

JANUARY 25, 1972, PROPOSAL

The main elements which Mr. Nixon presented included: A complete withdrawal of all U.S. and allied forces from South Vietnam; an exchange of all prisoners throughout Indochina; a cease-fire throughout Indo-

china; and a new presidential election in South Vietnam. Although there was no specific reference to North Vietnamese withdrawal in the Presidential address itself, the full text of the proposal as contained in the White House Press Release dated January 25, 1972, clearly stipulated the withdrawal of outside forces: "There will be international supervision of the military aspects of this agreement including the cease-fire and its provisions, the release of prisoners of war and innocent civilians, the withdrawal of outside forces from Indochina, and the implementation of the principle that all armed forces of the countries of Indochina must remain within their national frontiers."

The January 1972 proposal also indicated that "South Vietnam, together with the other countries of Indochina, should adopt a foreign policy consistent with the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva Accord." The first article of the Geneva Accord, which governs the military provisions, calls for the establishment of a "provisional military demarcation line [fixed at the 17th parallel] on either side of which the forces of the two parties shall be regrouped after their withdrawal, the forces of the People's Army of Vietnam (Vietminh) to the north of the line and the forces of the French Union to the south."

Over the years there has been endless discussion regarding the status of the demarcation line. It is not my purpose here to go further on this issue. However, it seems significant to point out that, permanent or provisional, after 18 years of territorial division and warfare, the 17th parallel does realistically separate two groups of people with contrasting governments, which are both internationally recognized, two peoples with conflicting ideologies, different social institutions and organizations, and with two distinct and colliding armies. Pending peaceful unification, the North Vietnamese soldiers must not cross the dividing line into South Vietnam any more than the East German army may cross into West German territory or the North Korean soldiers may go to South Korea.

MAY 8, 1972, PROPOSAL

In the face of North Vietnam's Easter invasion across the DMZ, President Nixon declared on April 26, 1972: "What we are witnessing here, what is being brutally inflicted upon the people of South Vietnam, is a clear case of naked and unprovoked aggression across an international border. There is only one word for it: invasion." By invading South Vietnam, the President said, North Vietnam was "in violation of the treaties they had signed in 1954 and in violation of the understanding they had reached with President Johnson in 1968 when he stopped the bombing of North Vietnam in return for arrangements which included their pledge not to violate the DMZ." When Hanoi refused to stop its offensive, the President on May 8 ordered the mining of North Vietnam's ports, the blockade of traffic in coastal and international waters, the destruction of rail and communications lines, and the continuation of air and naval strikes against North Vietnam's military targets. He said: "The actions I have ordered will cease when the following conditions are met: First, all American prisoners of war must be returned. Second, there must be an internationally supervised cease-fire throughout Indochina. Once prisoners of war are released, once the internationally supervised cease-fire has begun, we will stop all acts of force throughout Indochina, and at that time we will proceed with a complete withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam within four months."

Although he did not mention withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops, the mere fact that he took these strong punitive actions in response to the invasion implies that he is firm on the position that North Vietnamese troops must not intrude into the territory of South Vietnam.

The two conditions the President specifically required were those that the North Vietnamese must meet in order for him to stop the punitive actions, as he very clearly said, rather representing all the conditions to be met for a final and over-all settlement. Implicit in the May 8 proposal was another condition; that is, the right of the South Vietnamese to determine their own future. On November 2, Mr. Nixon reiterated this condition when speaking about the basic objectives of the May 8 address.

CONCLUSION

One conclusion can be drawn from this brief review of the record of the United States' past proposals; that is, in pursuing the single goal of helping defend the right of self-determination in Vietnam, the U.S. has viewed the presence of North Vietnamese troops in the South with extreme seriousness. The Easter invasion of last year which brought into South Vietnam nearly the entire North Vietnamese army added a new dimension to the gravity of the problem.

More than anyone else, President Nixon foresaw the impossibility of South Vietnam's exercising its own free will in the presence of non-South Vietnamese forces. Thus in his first proposal on May 14, 1969, he was most specific about this question: "What kind of a settlement will permit the South Vietnamese people to determine freely their own political future? Such a settlement will require the withdrawal of all non-South Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam and procedures for political choice that give each significant group in South Vietnam a real opportunity to participate in the political life of the nation."

One of the most difficult problems in the recent peace negotiations has been the fact that, in spite of the invasion, Hanoi has not publicly admitted the presence of its troops in the South. Nevertheless, the answer to this question has already been provided by President Nixon four years ago, also in his first peace plan cited at the beginning of this article. He said, "If North Vietnam wants to insist that it has no forces in South Vietnam, we will no longer debate the point—provided that its forces cease to be there and that we have reliable assurances that they will not return."

Indeed, it may be in the context of this very statement that an answer may be found for the Paris deadlock, since obviously one of the assurances would be Hanoi's intention to respect the DMZ.

GUN CONTROL IS A MUST

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, every day Americans die from gunshot wounds; not in Indochina but at home. Last week a city was terrorized for 2 days by a sniper. And heated arguments end in death. How long will it be before we legislate laws to correct this. Laws not meant to suppress freedom but reduce crime. WEEI, a radio station in Massachusetts is deeply involved in this fight to control handguns, and I would like, at this time, to insert their editorial of January 3, 1973, entitled "A Cheap Shot at Gun Control," into the RECORD:

A CHEAP SHOT AT GUN CONTROL

The National Rifle Association has declared open season on gun control legislation even before the new Congress gets down to business. WEEI refers to an article in the

current issue of the "American Rifleman," the NRA's monthly publication.

In our opinion, the article on Mexico's new gun control law uses scare tactics as a subtle argument against any new firearm laws in the United States. The article points out that under the new Mexican act all firearms must be registered and that in some cases "certain classes of citizens" will be limited to only one handgun in the home.

Without saying it outright, the NRA magazine article uses innuendo in forecasting a day when the Mexican gun law becomes a political tool to suppress people. Here's an example: The article begins by saying the law is viewed as a "two-edged sword" and adds that many gun owners "fear the blade may fall the wrong way in a time of severe internal stress." The story concludes by saying that many "Mexicans as well as Americans living in Mexico recall Mexico's history and wonder."

The real reason for the new Mexican gun control law is crime. Mexican officials believe that firearms control is a valuable tool with which to fight crime. WEEI agrees, and we hope those who read or hear about the article in the "American Rifleman" see through the NRA's latest cheap shot at gun control.

PUBLIC HAS RIGHT TO KNOW HOW ITS MONEY IS SPENT

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a serious loophole in present Federal law permits the recipient of public funds through a grant to refuse to open his books to public inspection.

Americans clearly have a right to know how their money is spent; therefore, I have introduced H.R. 1291, the public disclosure of information bill.

The present Freedom of Information Act, section 552 of title 5, United States Code, requires public disclosure by Federal agencies, but fails to include recipients of Federal grants.

The taxpayers of America provide the funds to run our Government, and they are entitled to a full accounting of how the funds are spent.

Under my bill, any person or agency, public or private, would have to make such an accounting. The only exceptions would be in the areas of national defense, foreign affairs, or in cases involving a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The public disclosure of information bill requires that a willingness to provide full public disclosure be made a condition to receiving a Federal grant; that complete records must be kept on how the funds are spent, and that refusal to make these records public will result in the grant being withdrawn.

At present, a Federal grant recipient need not open his books to the public; he is only held accountable to the agency administering the grant, or through the General Accounting Office. This can be a long, cumbersome procedure when prompt information is required.

An informed citizenry is essential to the preservation of our democracy; our freedoms wither in the closed, dark atmosphere of secrecy. Only by keeping in-

formed of its business can the public make the meaningful judgments required if our form of government is to work.

The Congress has a duty to act quickly to close the glaring loophole in present law so that the American taxpayer will be guaranteed the right to know how his money is being spent.

BETHEL COLLEGE

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, through the years the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has founded 37 4-year colleges. Today, only one survives. The sole survivor is Bethel College, which is located in Tennessee's Seventh Congressional District at McKenzie.

In recent years, the economic and educational situation in our country has not been conducive to the well-being of church-related institutions of higher learning. Yet Bethel's President, Dr. James E. McKee, and his fine faculty and staff have kept the college going and in many ways thriving.

Recently, the Sunday magazine section of the Nashville Tennessean published a feature story on Bethel College by Louise Davis. As a lifelong Cumberland Presbyterian and as a longtime member of the Bethel College Board of Trustees, I include Ms. Davis' story at this point in the RECORD:

LOVE SURVIVOR

(By Louise Davis)

Tiny Bethel College stands on its 100-acre campus at McKenzie, in West Tennessee, like an oasis of tranquility in a turbulent world.

For 100 years it has stood there, and for 30 years before that the college surmounted knotty obstacles at nearby McMoresville—a serene little town of exceptional charm.

On the Bethel campus today only the songs of mockingbirds flitting through red-leaved dogwood trees disturb the autumn quiet. Cotton bolls blowing off gin-bound trucks along Carroll County highways map out another world, another peace.

There is not even a security officer on the campus. No need for one, Dr. James McKee, president of the college, said. There is a trusting campus, a family-like student body.

"We know every student here, and they know each other," McKee said. "Every student is recognized as an individual, an individual with special potentials. No one is lost in the crowd."

The rugged individualism of both the college and the denomination that built it have come dearly. The fact that there is a college there at all is testimony to the tenacity and determination of hardy Cumberland Presbyterians for 130 years.

It is something of a miracle that the brave little college—reaching back into Tennessee's western frontier days—has survived war, withering Depression and devastating splits within the church.

The struggle to maintain the college is unending.

The question is: Can that four-year college, fully accredited and holding staunchly to high standards, survive today's rising costs?

The same crisis faces other private, church-owned colleges over the nation. But the

problem at Bethel is heightened by the fact that one of the smallest denominations in the country, the Cumberland Presbyterian, owns and operates the college.

With fewer than 85,000 members in the United States, the church is pushing hard to keep the college alive and growing.

In many ways, Bethel shows dynamic growth.

New buildings are going up. Every building on the campus except the administration building has been built or completely renovated since 1965. Two dormitories, a health-education building, a fine arts center, a library and learning center, a science center and a college center are among the new buildings.

A multi-million-dollar program begun in 1965 is scheduled to bring more improvements to the campus by 1975.

New scholastic aims are being added to the old. Students from 24 states and 13 countries are enrolled.

Even so, Bethel, like other small private colleges, is feeling the decline in student population. The post-World War II population explosion has tapered off. Young men who were going to college rather than go to war a few years ago are not under that pressure today.

"There are fewer scholarships available to students today," McKee said. "Our enrollment today is 505—down considerably from our peak of 812 in 1966."

But Bethel is not discouraged. After all, it is the only one of the 37 colleges founded by the Cumberland Presbyterian Church that has survived.

Part of its strength comes from its flexibility. Though there is still emphasis on Greek and Hebrew, philosophy and Bible study, there is also a strong program in business administration and economics.

The importance of religion is stressed, but there is no denominational indoctrination. Students from many faiths attend the college.

Students have a part in all decisions on the campus. They have representatives on all administrative committees. They not only express their views at the meetings, but have full voting rights.

Luis Albarracin, freshman from Colombia, South America, and Susan Wu, senior from Java, were hurrying across the campus together as Tennessean staff photographer Gerald Holly stopped them. They chatted happily about Bethel's appeal to them.

"The foreign student in this country usually has a difficult time, attending classes in a foreign language," Susan said, with only a trace of Indonesian accent showing through her excellent English. "But teachers at Bethel are helpful. So are the students. Everybody is so friendly."

Luis nodded his agreement. He came to Bethel this fall, he said, because his older brother, now a senior, came first and fell in love with the West Tennessee college.

Kay Forester, a pretty red-haired music major from Campbellsville, Ky., was enthusiastic about the fine arts department.

"The academic life offers great opportunity," Kay said. "The faculty is strong. And Bethel is a place everybody loves."

There is no shunting of freshmen off to graduate students, acting as teachers—a chief complaint at larger colleges and universities. All of the faculty have graduate degrees, and most of them have Ph.D. degrees.

And there is a continuity on the faculty that is rare today. It binds students, faculty and alumni in bonds of sentiment and loyalty.

"You can't cut a tree on the Bethel campus without hearing from the alumni," McKee—himself a Bethel graduate—said. "Everything on this campus is loved."

About 50 per cent of the students come from Tennessee, and most of them are from

Carroll County or adjoining Henry and Weakley counties. It is estimated that practically every public school in those three counties has faculty members educated at Bethel.

And even though small state colleges, like the University of Tennessee at Martin, have cut into the enrollment of private colleges, Bethel can still compete, both in costs and curriculum. Bethel—once oriented to students of that area—is now supported by city churches and draws students from urban areas.

"I sense a return to the country," McKee said. "There are more students who want calmness and the contemplative atmosphere. Bethel has been calm when other campuses were plagued with demonstrations."

"The students here had peace rallies, but there were never any sit-ins. There was no taking over the buildings. Students are interested in national and international affairs. They are active in the presidential campaign. They are registered. They will vote."

Dr. Raymon Burroughs, executive vice-president and academic dean, said students are deeply involved in the civic and church life of McKenzie, a town whose population has stood at 5,000 for years.

"Student groups take on projects like painting the town park benches, or painting homes in the poorer parts of town," Burroughs said. "They take part in the Red Cross bloodmobile program. They teach Sunday school classes in various churches and denominations over town."

Rather than conduct services on the campus, the college encourages students to go to the church of their choice in the community.

"There is diversity on our faculty—some Baptists and Methodists as well as Presbyterians," Burroughs said. "Not all of our trustees are Cumberland Presbyterian."

The purpose of the college is, in fact, to "provide a program of liberal arts education designed to aid students in understanding and preparing for their vocation, as viewed from the Christian perspective."

McKee admitted that there have been a few students involved in use of drugs and alcohol. He is convinced that a small school is better prepared to prevent those problems, and more likely to deal successfully with them.

"We talk problems out," McKee said. "There is sometimes conflict, but it can be resolved. We refer to the 'Bethel family.' We resolve problems that way."

About 60 per cent of the students are men, but Bethel has been co-educational almost from the beginning. Early college records show tuition and board paid for girls enrolled at Bethel as early as 1852.

That was when Bethel College stood on a gentle hill along a winding road entering McMoresville, 12 miles from McKenzie. On that same spot today stands McMoresville's public school, and they were both in sight of the little Bethel Church that gave the college its name.

Bethel College was founded in 1842, when McMoresville was the leading town in Carroll County. Bethel Church was one of the strongest in West Tennessee, and the great Presbyterian preachers of the day preached there—weeks at a time.

The whole Cumberland Presbyterian denomination grew out of the "great revival" of 1800. Frontiersmen—long separated from their home churches in Virginia and the Carolinas—would bundle up their families in wagons to camp out for a week on camp grounds where famous preachers reminded them that there was something more important than fortunes to be found "out West."

Some of the camp meetings were Methodist, some Baptist, some Presbyterian. In parts of Middle and West Tennessee, the Presbyterians made a deep impression. They returned to their home communities to form new congregations, but there were not enough preachers to go around.

The Presbyterians, always severe in their educational requirements for ordained ministers, told the frontier Presbyterians, in effect, that they would have to wait their turn. There was no rushing the education of a minister.

The new Presbyterian formed a presbytery and designated that district as Cumberland—taking the name from the region. The Cumberland Presbytery had no thought of breaking away from the rest of the Presbyterian church.

But on February 10, 1810, three determined men met in a log house in Dickson County (a replica of the home now stands on the spot in Montgomery Bell State Park) to form their Cumberland Presbytery as a separate unit.

They would set up a "short course" for training their ministers. They would make it possible for ministers to be ordained after standing stiff examinations. "Probationary ministers" would have to stand tests in "English grammar, geography, astronomy, natural and moral philosophy, and church history."

There were other differences. The group in Samuel McAdow's log house that February disagreed with other Presbyterians on the matter of predestination.

For three years the Cumberland Presbytery negotiated with Presbyterian authorities—hoping still to function within the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (which included all Presbyterians in this country.)

But their differences could not be resolved, and the Cumberland Presbytery made the final break. In 1913 they set themselves up as a separate denomination and called themselves Cumberland Presbyterians.

From there, they fanned out over the rapidly expanding frontier, reaching from Kentucky and Tennessee to Kansas, Missouri, Texas, California. They were winning new members by the thousands, establishing new churches and new synods (a church council).

They were stung by the parent church's lack of responsiveness to frontier needs. They soon determined to organize seminaries that would put the same emphasis on education that the mother church did.

In 1826 the Cumberland Presbyterians opened their first college, Cumberland College, in Princeton, Ky.

One financial crisis after another doomed that college, and by 1842 it was moved to Lebanon, Tenn., where Tennessee citizens promised to pay some of the bills. To distinguish it from Cumberland College in Princeton, the church called the Lebanon school Cumberland University.

As it turned out, the law school at the Lebanon institution was to spread its fame farther than its seminary ever did.

Meantime, the West Tennessee division of the church, centering its activities around Bethel Church at McMoresville, made plans for its own seminary. In 1842, the same year that Cumberland University was founded in Lebanon, Bethel College was founded at McMoresville.

The 20-acre campus was just down the road from Bethel Church, still active today. Planned first as a seminary, to train ministers, Bethel became a four year college in 1850. From the first, it included a preparatory department.

Even on the preparatory level, Bethel put the emphasis on scholarship. Students in the big brick classroom building on the hill struggled with Latin and Greek, science and mathematics, astronomy and philosophy. History, political science and economics were required, as were courses in Bible, rhetoric and composition.

Discipline at Bethel was severe. Students were admonished not to sleep on feather beds. They were too soft for developing strong character.

One story of early discipline involves the Rev. J. N. Roach, first principal at Bethel. Regarded as a "master disciplinarian," Roach "used to employ the switch as an instru-

ment of discipline, not sparing even the young men."

He would take "the pupil into the woods," where he would "pray a while, and then whip a while."

"After whipping and praying had alternated in one case for some time, Roach asked the student, 'What more can I do for you?'"

"I think you had better pray again," the smarting boy replied.

Bethel College had already launched a \$50,000 fund-raising campaign when Civil War brought everything to a halt. Ministers from Memphis to Mayfield, Ky., had scouted the wealthier members of their congregation to pledge \$1,000 each for the college.

Abner Edwards Cooper, Cumberland Presbyterian minister in the McMoresville area for 45 years, was president of Bethel College's board of trustees for its first 41 years. His carefully kept records—never before published—of the original donors to Bethel's endowment include the great Presbyterian names of the era.

Reuben Burrow, a leading theologian of the denomination and president of the Board of Visitors at the college, was first to pledge \$1,000, on January 20, 1859.

Cooper, on March 4, 1859, was the second to pledge \$1,000, and on that same day Felix Johnson and N. W. Smith of McMoresville promised \$1,000 each.

There were smaller gifts—some of them \$500 or \$100, some of them \$10 and \$5. The donors were planning bigger endowments, and endowed chairs.

But they had hardly started paying off their pledges when Civil War came. McMoresville was fought over in repeated campaigns. The college was closed for the duration of the war, and the buildings occupied by first one army and then the other.

One of the casualties of the war was Bethel College's prized telescope—a \$3,000 instrument made in England and said to be the "best telescope west of the Appalachian mountains and the Ohio River."

The Rev. C. J. Bradley, later president of Bethel College, purchased the telescope in 1852. Astronomy, recognized then as the key to much scientific study, was a required course. The thick-walled classroom building completed in 1851 included a roof-top dome where the telescope was mounted.

Federal soldiers occupying the building in 1862 did not know what the telescope was. They thought it was the barrel of a brass cannon and confiscated it. But, realizing their error, they preserved it. And after the war they returned it to the college.

Generations of Bethel students used it, and today the telescope is cherished as the only physical link with the original Bethel College at McMoresville.

Immediately after the Civil War, Bethel College reopened at McMoresville, and might have been there to this day if it had not been for the advent of the railroad.

Tradition has it that Bethel College opposed having a railroad come to McMoresville at first—for fear of bringing a worldly atmosphere.

But by 1872 the college and the town were suffering from lack of transportation. Little McMoresville was shriveling up. McKenzie, which had not existed a few decades before, welcomed two railroads: the N.C. & St. L. and L. and N. By 1870, McKenzie's population had reached 1000.

Moreover, a leading citizen of the booming railroad town, J. M. McKenzie, donated some 85 acres to Bethel College if they would move the campus to his town. To make the college more accessible by train, Bethel moved to McKenzie in 1872.

By that move, apparently, the survival of Bethel College was made possible in a crisis 34 years later. For McKenzie, in his deed of the land to the college, stipulated that it would go back to his heirs if it were used for anything except the college.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States had been split into two divisions during the Civil War—those who sympathized with the Union forces and those who were loyal to the Confederacy. There are still the two separate groups, the "Northern Presbyterians" (United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.) and the "Southern Presbyterians" (Presbyterian Church, U.S.).

The Cumberland Presbyterians were neither. They steered a neutral course throughout the Civil War, contending that the church must not get involved in politics. Members fought in both armies.

Founded in the cotton-and-tobacco-rich lands of West Tennessee, the Cumberland Presbyterians included many slaveholders. But the denomination had churches in anti-slavery Kansas, Indiana and Illinois.

After surviving the Civil War, the Cumberland Presbyterians were split apart some 40 years later. In 1906, a great portion of the denomination joined the "Northern Presbyterians." The split was disastrous.

"We would have been one of the largest denominations if it had not been for that group who joined the United Presbyterian, U.S.A.," McKee said.

The split did not come easily. The wounds were deep.

"Our church has never gotten over the 1906 episode," McKee said.

The "Northern Presbyterians" claimed many of the physical assets of the Cumberland Presbyterians, including brief use of the Bethel College campus as denominational headquarters. But the campus property would have gone back to the heirs of the donor if the land were used for anything except Bethel College.

So Bethel was returned to the control of the Cumberland Presbyterians.

From the earliest days, Bethel has struck out in new directions.

Even in the 1850s, when board in the dormitories was \$7 a month and candles came extra, girls were admitted to the college. Old college records kept by Cooper, first president of the trustees, have just come to light, and they show board paid by girls from Paris and Trezevant and Huntington in 1852, 1853 and 1854.

For the girls, in the beginning, Bethel, was a finishing school. For young men, up to 1850, it was a seminary. From that date in, it was a four-year college with rigid scholastic standards.

Marshall Stewart, head of Nashville's public library system, said his career was shaped by Bethel College even before he became a student there. As a McKenzie youth, son of a Bethel graduate, he felt at home on the campus.

"Some of my happiest memories are of summer nights in the field, lying on my back, looking at the stars through that old Bethel telescope," Stewart said. "Dr. John W. Dishman, professor of Bible, was an amateur astronomer."

"When I was a high school boy, we'd take the telescope to the field. I've spent many a night on my back, looking at Saturn and its rings."

Stewart is "all for small colleges, especially for the sensitive student."

"You get a feeling of belonging that you don't get elsewhere," Stewart said. "You get more individual attention. A person finds himself better. He feels his worth more."

There is an active social life, but little formal entertaining. Teachers spend a lifetime there, and their character becomes as much a part of the campus as the buildings and trees.

Claude Callicott, Nashville lawyer who was graduated from Bethel College, is convinced there is no higher quality training anywhere.

"I thought I got the finest training at Bethel I could have gotten in the United States," Callicott said.

"We had all the sports then, and I played football, basketball and baseball. The debating society was exciting then (class of

1926), and it was fine training for a law career."

Owen Howell, president of Genesco, Nashville's largest industry, was president of the board of trustees at Bethel until this year and still serves on the board. Not a graduate of Bethel himself, Howell is convinced of the need for such a college.

"There is a definite need for the small liberal arts college that is not state-oriented," Howell said. "We think Bethel offers an environment healthy for the youth today."

"Our graduates do well in other universities when they do graduate work. We rank quite well scholastically. Obviously the smaller classes are effective."

Even though Cumberland Presbyterians have more members in cities than in small towns today, Howell thinks of it as a "grass-roots sort of church, built around farm folks."

Howell is one of them. He says they are people who love the farm, who have a free and independent spirit that has helped them accept new ideas.

Bethel was among the first southern colleges to admit Negroes. The college has, since pre-Civil War days, admitted women on an equal footing with men. Bethel began placing students on administrative committees long before most colleges considered the idea.

The great weakness of the school is that it trains more teachers and preachers than any other profession (the seminary was moved to Memphis in 1962), and neither of those occupations reaps much financial reward. Alumni contributions are necessarily small.

The present enrollment of 505 is not enough to sustain it.

"We are actively looking for new students," Howell said. "We need a total of 800 or 900 students."

Howell thinks the future of the small, independent college will be dependent in government subsidy "of some sort."

"There is a need for that sort of school," he said. "We are stronger financially than we have ever been. We are stronger scholastically than we've ever been."

"We are on firm ground."

THIS DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam by the U.S. forces has spread dismay throughout our land.

The peace that seemed so close, that seemed a certainty by Christmastime, suddenly evaporated.

Typical of the reaction of our people over the renewed bombing is the following editorial written by John Weber in the Murray County Herald at Slayton, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, which, with your permission, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it can be shared with my colleagues and the many who read this publication:

THIS DOESN'T MAKE SENSE—

The Nixon administration has not yet indicated why increased bombing of North Vietnam was authorized, but taking the action at face value we find it difficult to understand. In fact, although this newspaper has usually sided with the "hawks" in this war, it just doesn't make sense.

In the first place, the United States has discovered through unfortunate experience that heavy bombing will not end the war, it

will merely complicate the military activities of the north. Secondly, we are in the midst of peace negotiations which have resulted in some encouragement at least. More so, in fact, than ever before in the long history of this unpopular and unwanted military involvement.

Why, then, do we pick this particular time to escalate the bombing of North Vietnam? There has to be a reason, but it is difficult to imagine. Perhaps the Viet Cong are planning on mounting a new offensive and the bombing is designed to slow the flow of military supplies. But if this is the case, why wasn't a now truly disappointed American public informed of this possibility?

Under the present circumstances and at the present time, we do not feel that the United States is acting wisely in either the war effort or the peace effort.

HARRY S. TRUMAN: OF THE PEOPLE

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker—

Some are born great . . . some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them.

William Shakespeare's insight had a perfect embodiment in Harry S. Truman whose greatness was thrust upon him suddenly with the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Few at the time thought him equal to the task. Even Mr. Truman, ever a humble and forthright man, held no exaggerated opinion of himself.

But Harry Truman was the sort of man who, equipped with a sharp sense of history and a respect for decisive leadership, rose to the challenge of leading a troubled nation at a very critical time in American history. His philosophy was simple: That one has a moral duty not to shirk one's obligations, that government is an instrument of the people, not of special privilege, and that we must "repay our debts to God, to our dead, and to our children" by working at our fullest capacities.

Yet this man of high principle was also a direct and salty character who had an easy philosophical attitude toward the capriciousness of life. After the abortive assassination attempt at Blair House in 1950, he shrugged:

A President has to expect these things. The only thing you have to worry about is bad luck. I never have bad luck.

The milestones of the Truman era are justly celebrated. The Marshall and point IV plans are surely two of America's greatest contributions to the peace of the world; for, by "building up rapidly the combined political, economic, and military strength of the free world," they formed the cornerstone of President Truman's enlightened foreign policy: That American generosity could enable Western Europe to repel the tyranny of communism.

The dropping of the bomb on Hiroshima to bring a swift end to World War II was, of course, a controversial decision then and now. But President Truman took sole responsibility for this momentous action—"The buck stops

here" philosophy was never more apparent—which was made in calculation that a half million lives would be lost were the ground war to continue. His dismissal of General MacArthur was similarly controversial, characterizing Truman's decisiveness in implementing an unwavering belief in civilian control of the military.

The Truman wartime maneuvers are well known. Less acclaimed, but equally important, were his great efforts on the domestic front; he himself voiced an overriding concern with "balancing the human budget," and his "Fair Deal" program contained the seeds of today's civil rights, housing, and social welfare programs. Believing that "man has the moral and the intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice," President Truman's faith in the spirit of the American people was unceasing.

When we remember President Truman, we think primarily of his great individuality and tough decisionmaking. His lack of egotism and courage to do the unpopular thing are rare in history. Popularity and polls were discounted as he said that Presidents who allowed themselves to be led by the press and pollsters were "complete washouts." "The President hears a hundred voices telling him that he is the greatest man in the world. He must listen carefully indeed to hear the one voice that tells him he is not."

Harry Truman listened to one voice: his conscience. His actions were rooted in the solemn belief that no single problem was insurmountable "if approached in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount." Indeed, he could have been speaking of himself when he said that what counts "is right and wrong, and leadership—man with fortitude, honesty, and a belief in the right that make epochs in the history of the world."

President Truman was an example of what a basically earthy and simple man with old-fashioned values can do if he sets his mind, heart, and energy to it. Perhaps that is his great legacy to us all.

My deepest condolences go to Bess Truman, a gallant lady who, like her husband, was unimpressed by the trappings of power and served her country proudly as a First Lady of great dignity, and to Margaret Truman whose devotion to her father is evident in her recent memoir as she writes that—

A strong man, whom I happen to love very much, did his duty. I am confident that history will do him justice.

Perhaps, if it were possible to sum up Harry Truman, one might say that he was, first and last, a family man—to his mother and sister, his wife and daughter, and to the people of his country.

CANCEL HIGHWAY TRUST FUND IF FUNDS IMPOUNDED

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to correct what I consider an unjust situation.

This situation exists because the OMB continues to impound moneys for construction of highways, while the taxpayer continues to pay taxes for the construction of highways.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayer is being taken, or so it seems to me. To correct this, my bill will cancel the taxes on gasoline whenever part, or all, of the highway trust fund is being impounded.

My bill is as simple as that. I do not want to take up the Congress time with a long discussion of this bill except to say it is just, and maybe, just maybe, this could be a method for the Congress to assert its power in the question of impoundment.

Perhaps this bill, if enacted, would assert to the executive branch that the Congress still has some prerogatives over the budget—unless the executive decides to impose taxes on its own.

HEADING INTO 1973

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, as the territory of Guam's first nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, I am honored to serve, as are the people of Guam proud to be represented, in this august body. As many of my colleagues may know, I previously served my people in a unique capacity: that of their elected Representative in Washington. In that position I spent the last 8 years working with Congress and the agencies of the executive branch to gain benefits for the American citizens of Guam.

Last year, Congress passed H.R. 8787, a bill which authorized the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands to each elect a Delegate to the Congress. With the passage of this historic measure, all American citizens became assured of representation in the Congress, and, in particular, our fellow Americans on Guam are in a better position to express their hopes and needs to the Members of this Congress. Let me hasten to add that the Congress has been sympathetic and kind to our need for more local self-government in Guam as well.

With the assistance of the 93d Congress, Guam will continue to grow and prosper as it has during the past decade.

To those of you who have recently visited our beautiful island, you are aware of the tremendous changes that have been wrought there through the hard work of our people and the welcome infusion of Federal support to keep improving our economy. As a result of this happy melding of Federal aid and the dedicated effort at the local and national levels, Guam has grown from a sleepy tropical island to a thriving American community of more than 100,000. Today, Guam is proud to serve as a bastion of America's defense and a showcase of American democracy in the western Pacific. The people of the Far East, and in particular those living within the Pacific basin area, look to us as an example of American commitment to the

uplifting of people to dignity and self-respect—in the democratic tradition.

Although it is my sincere wish that all of my colleagues could visit Guam in the near future to view firsthand our territory and the progress we have made, I appreciate the limitations that time and our great distance from the mainland place on us. Accordingly, I therefore insert a recent editorial written by Mr. Joseph Murphy, editor of the Pacific Daily News, to be placed in the RECORD at this point. I am certain that anyone reading this excellent commentary about what lies in store for Guam during the year ahead will better understand the needs and aspirations of their fellow Americans in the Western Pacific.

The article follows:

[From the Pacific Daily News, Jan. 1, 1973]

HEADING INTO 1973

The people of Guam have every right to move into the new year, 1973, with rising expectations for a full, prosperous year, judging that by the soaring achievements of the year just past.

Figures are difficult to obtain, primarily because most of them are based on a fiscal year, which is July to June 30, rather than December to January, but if figures were available for 1972 it would certainly show that by every conceivable standard of economic measurement it was truly a fantastic year.

Tourism leaped higher than ever, as new hotels opened their doors, and new jet service came in, particularly from Japan. Along with the hotels came new restaurants, tours, night clubs. During the past year nearly 4,000 new jobs were created on the island, according to figures. New construction was going up at a record pace, as much as \$78,000,000 worth, depending again, on how it is figured. This included some of the new hotels, the Daily News Building, Pedro's Plaza, the American Pacific Life Building, and dozens of commercial structures, hundreds of new apartment units, and hundreds of new homes.

Certainly no astute observer of the local scene can say that the rose is off the bloom, and construction will be slowed down in the coming year. The huge Cabras Island power plant alone, at a cost of \$25,000,000, will pick up the slack for other building projects. Several large hotels are presently under construction, including the \$10,000,000 18 story Towa Reef Hotel. Others are projected.

U.S. military and GovGuam building programs should be in the millions, including some long needed highway construction. The Navy will be building a new hangar at NAS, and additional housing units.

There is every indication, in fact, that during 1973 we will be seeing just as much construction as we did in 1972. The shift might be towards housing and government projects, and away from commercial buildings. Hyundai, for example, will start soon on several hundred new homes in the Barrigada Hill area. Kaiser is working on a large number of homes in the Windward Hills area, while workers are already beginning on a large urban renewal project in Yona.

We have no way of knowing what will happen to military spending here in 1973, because that depends, on a very large part, on the war situation, and the situation in Japan, Korea, Thailand, Taiwan, the Philippines, and South Vietnam. We have always assumed that Guam won't be hurt too much by any drastic cut-back in defense spending, because it is expected that some of that pull-back may be to Guam, instead of away from. It's possible that we might see increased military activity in the Northern Marianas, for instance. This sort of activity will affect Guam greatly, because most of the trans-

portation and communication will have to pass through here.

Land sales, we would judge, might slow down for the simple fact that land prices have soared so dramatically in recent years they seemingly can't get much higher. Even now real estate salesmen report running into some opposition in trying to get ever increasing prices for the land. Yet, when you compare land prices on land short Guam, to places like Tokyo, or Honolulu, we find we've still got a long ways to go.

We would expect that apartment construction might slow down, for the simple reason that they have been overbuilt in recent years, and for the first time in recent history, Guam apartment hunters have a choice of units to choose from. This isn't necessarily bad, however, because the old "boonie" type apartments, with the leaky roof, and holed out screen door might become a thing of the past. Perhaps, in the future, the new apartment units will have all the amenities, including pools, and carpets. Overconstruction on apartments could possibly bring the price down to an acceptable level as well.

We've watched Guam burst gloriously out of it's shell in ten short years, since the security restriction was at last lifted, and real civilian progress first came to the island. As recently as 10 years ago, in 1962, total construction on the island was only slightly over \$2,000,000—a far cry from the nearly \$80,000,000, a decade later. There were no tourists in 1962, either, while 150,000 are expected to arrive this year. In 1962, a decade ago, only 886 civilian aircraft landed on Guam, with that figure jumping to over 5,000 last year. Imports in 1962 totalled some \$20,000,000, jumping to far over \$125,000,000 during the past year.

No, Guam is no longer a sleepy, tropical island, lying listlessly 'neath fluttering palm trees. It is a viable, prosperous, vigorous American community. This is not to say that by dollars alone we can solve all the island's problems. These problems have been accelerated by the rapid growth of the community. We have to face up to making a renewed campaign to increase the capacity of our utilities, power, water, telephone, and refuse service. We have to attack vigorously our dismal highway problems. We have to contend with rising crimes of violence. We have to provide more and better parks and recreational areas for both our children, and our visitors. We would like to see a better agricultural program, a viable fishing industry, and a better Marina facility. We would like to see more low cost housing, and better utilization of the land, including green-belt areas. We would like to see a better beach maintenance program.

All this, however, is why we're stepping so high and jauntily into the year 1973. We know that we have problems, and we always will. It is a challenge to us all to face this challenge, to find solutions, to make Guam, and the world a better place to live. We're looking forward to 1973, just to see what is going to happen next. JCM.

RAILROAD RETIREES ARE VICTIMS OF INFLATION

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, America's railroad retirees, like most others living on fixed income, are seeing their Federal benefits erode away under the relentless attack of inflation. While the 92d Congress approved a 20-percent increase in benefits, the increases simply

are not keeping pace with the rise in our cost of living.

Railroad retirees are not gaining in benefits—they are not even holding ground: They are falling behind in the value of their benefits. Many live in my Sixth Congressional District of Florida, and I know personally of their often marginal existence and the many hardships the retirees and their families must face.

To remedy this antiquated retirement program and provide needed relief, I have introduced H.R. 1296, a bill which would tie future benefits to the cost of living. As the cost of living rises, benefits would automatically increase.

This would eliminate the need for railroad retirees having to keep coming back to the Congress every 2 years pleading for deserved increases in their benefits. Unfortunately, in the past, they have sometimes been the victims of candidates who "play politics" at their expense by holding out the promise of support for badly needed hikes in railroad retirement benefits in exchange for political support on election day.

The time is long overdue to take politics out of America's railroad retirement program and provide the benefits our retirees have so justly earned. Congress should act promptly to approve H.R. 1296. Our railroad retirees are entitled to no less.

PUBLIC SERVICE INDIANA PARTNER IN DEVELOPING NEW ENERGY SOURCE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon at the Department of the Interior an \$8 million contract will be signed that is the first step in construction of a multi-million-dollar coal gasification plant near Terre Haute.

The Office of Coal Research of the Department of the Interior has authorized an industry team headed by Westinghouse Electric Corp. to proceed pending signing of the contract. Partners are public Service Indiana, AMAX Coal Co. and Bechtel Corp. Ultimate cost is around \$80 million.

What this amounts to is construction of a system for generating electric power, without pollution from fly ash, sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide. It will utilize the large reserves of high-sulfur Indiana coal, as well as that from other parts of the country, and still meet stringent Federal and State air pollution standards. The process is not new but recent developments—more efficient and pollution-free—are new.

This comes at a most opportune time, when reports state that the President's pending message on energy will call for conversion of a large segment of the Nation's electric power producing plants from oil-fired to coal-fired generating units. Reportedly, the administration has been convinced that reliance on the Nation's still-massive coal reserves over the

next 15 years to meet the undeniable growing energy shortage will be the best course to follow. Coal reserves are estimated to be good for 400 years.

We have, admittedly, an "environmental crisis" and an "energy crisis." To meet the first, last year, the requirements were—which have been carried out so far: No Alaskan pipeline; no oil refineries on the east coast; oppose oil imports, due to spillage danger; cut down on shale and strip mining due to damage to the countryside; cut back on nuclear powerplants because of radioactivity dangers; limit offshore drilling; discourage building port facilities for natural gas.

On the other hand, the energy crisis is no joke. By 1980 we will have to import almost half the 22.5 million barrels a day of petroleum we will consume by that time. We now import 25 percent of the daily 14.7 million barrels. Costs: by 1980, between \$12 and \$15 billion.

Go ahead to the year 2000: It would see a value of U.S. demand for primary minerals of \$170 billion, compared with a 1970 figure of \$43.1 billion.

The gasification process such as will be used in this plant is basically simple. Coal, air, and steam are fed to a gas producer. A reducing gas leaves the product at the top, and ash at the bottom. The gas is cooled and then scrubbed with chemicals, for further purification and is then burned and expanded in a gas turbine generator. The gas leaving the turbine goes to a boiler; the remaining heat generates steam. Removal of sulfur and ash is right at 100 percent.

Clean, synthetic, pipeline quality gas; utilization of our mammoth reserves of coal; pollution-free conversion process; more energy for the soaring needs—all four are combined into one very advantageous whole by this process. Public Service Indiana is to be congratulated on their efforts in this. It is just another example of how problems created by man, due to technology, can also be settled by man, using that same technology.

ORRICK A. LOCHER ESTABLISHES MUSIC PUBLISHING FIRM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to one of my constituents, Mr. Orrick A. Locher of Essex, Md., who has become a music publisher.

Mr. Locher has been writing song lyrics and poems for 42 years, and has formed his own business, Lochraven Music. He plans to publish on sheet music only songs which have been previously recorded. Mr. Locher has said that only his own compositions will be published.

A book of 28 of Mr. Locher's poems, entitled "Poems of Inspiration," was published in New York in 1969.

Mr. Locher came to Essex with his wife, Mary Sue, in December 1951. He

works as a machinist and as a part-time bank security guard on weekends.

The Baltimore area is very proud of Mr. Locher's accomplishments, and I am honored to represent him in the U.S. Congress.

JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James A. Farley, past chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and former Postmaster General of the United States, has always held a special place in the minds and hearts of his countrymen.

Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues an interesting article concerning this great American, which was written by Mr. Thomas Parry, and appeared in the Raleigh, N.C., News Observer.

The article reads as follows:

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, Oct. 15, 1972]

"GENTLEMAN JIM" STILL KEEPS FARLEY
BRISK PACE

(By Thomas Parry)

Somewhere along the way James A. Farley became both man and legend at the same time. Nobody is quite sure when it happened, but everybody agrees it took place a long time ago.

Its roots probably stretch back to the 1932 Democratic Convention, for it was there that the fruits of Farley's labors materialized with the nomination (and subsequent election) of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President of the United States. Beginning on the very day of Roosevelt's re-election as Governor of New York in 1930, James A. Farley set into motion the political machinery that would eventually carry FDR into the White House. Farley worked closely with governors, senators, congressmen, members of the Democratic National Committee, state chairmen, county chairmen, and campaign workers at large to effect the most successful presidential campaign organization seen in this century. President Roosevelt expressed his personal gratitude by appointing Farley postmaster general, and designating him chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

When 1936 rolled around, it was an instant-replay of the previous campaign with Farley once again guiding Roosevelt to a second term in the White House despite emerging policy differences between the two. Boldly, "Big Jim" predicted to newspaper reporters that FDR's opponent, Governor Alf Landon, would carry two states, Maine and Vermont. Sure enough, his prediction came true.

In the late thirties Farley, along with most other political observers, concluded that Roosevelt would seek the presidency only twice.

To do otherwise would break a tradition begun when President Washington refused a third term in 1797. When Roosevelt's ambition got the best of him, Farley broke with "the chief" and had his own name placed in nomination at the 1940 Convention.

Farley recalls: "Even then his health was not good. I begged him to return to Warm Springs—he had contributed enough to his country. I felt the Democrats would win again with any candidate of stature, because the country appreciated the New Deal reforms. The people were not about to return

the country's destiny at that time to the Republicans.

"The third term, of course, brought on the fourth term, and by the fourth term, Mr. Roosevelt was a very sick man. A man in better mental health would have performed differently at Teheran and Yalta, would not have divided Germany so ineptly and left slave-states in Europe. A healthy president would have realized the horrible consequences.

"I have, of course, regretted the fact that my disagreement with him on the third term broke a friendship that had existed for all those years, and I saw him only three or four times after I retired, and I felt very badly about that."

In 1941, "Big Jim" was elected as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation—a position he retains today at age 84.

Besides being politician supreme, Jim Farley is also America's all-time champion letter writer. After the 1936 election, Postmaster General Farley sat down and dictated over 36,000 personal letters to Democratic workers from all over the country—and in the process exhausted six secretaries! Even today he dictates and signs (in his famous green ink) an average of 120 letters a day. And each year, on his birthday, he receives approximately 6,000 cards from every corner of the world, all of which are personally acknowledged by "Gentleman Jim."

As Coca-Cola's number one salesman, Mr. Farley attended 131 luncheons and 105 banquets in 1971. Most of these were sponsored by groups interested in foreign trade, and many utilized his talent as an after-dinner speaker.

Earlier this year "Gentleman Jim" was hospitalized with what doctor's diagnosed as a minor heart attack. But it took more than a few chest pains to sideline this political giant. Even while he was recuperating, Jim Farley was working eight hours a day dictating letters and making telephone calls. Farley reports that he's now feeling fine and that "I'm back at the Coca-Cola office every morning at 9:15 and leave between 4:00 and 4:30 as the doctor feels that is sufficient time and wants me to get back to my apartment, which is only three blocks from the office, and rent until dinner-time."

"For the time being, I am going to eliminate going to banquets and go only to business luncheons where I do not have to make any speeches . . . although it doesn't follow that there might not be occasions in the fall that I might want to participate in."

James A. Farley has been called everything from an "affable Irish giant" to "kingmaker." He has known more popes, prime ministers, presidents, and potentates than perhaps any other man of his generation. He can tell you about his conversations with Pius XII, Churchill, Mussolini, and even present-day leaders like Madame Gandhi and Richard Nixon.

Jim Farley the man and Jim Farley the legend are inseparable. To be sure, he is both rolled up into one.

LEGISLATION TO RESTORE MEMORIAL DAY AND VETERANS DAY TO THEIR TRADITIONAL DATES

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I have again introduced legislation to restore both Memorial Day and Veterans Day to their traditional dates

of May 30 and November 11. There is no significance whatsoever in having Memorial Day fall on the fourth Monday of May and Veterans Day on the fourth Monday of October. May 30 has been the traditional day in which we have honored those who fought for our country and died in so doing. November 11 was the date when World War I ended. It has great significance, not only to our veterans and their families, but also to all American citizens. I hope that prompt action will be taken by the Congress to restore these two traditional dates which mean so much to our veterans and citizens.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today in commemorating the 44th anniversary of the birth of slain civil rights leader, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who probably best represents and was most vigorously involved in the black struggle for freedom and equality in this country.

Two weeks ago today we observed the 110th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863. In the conclusion of its report, "Freedom to the Free: Century of Emancipation," issued in 1963, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission made the following observation:

We have come a far journey from a distant era in the 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation. At the beginning of it, there was slavery. At the end, there is citizenship. Citizenship, however, is a fragile word with an ambivalent meaning. The condition of citizenship is not yet full-blown or fully realized for the American Negro. There is still more ground to cover. The final chapter in the struggle for equality has yet to be written.

Because of Dr. King's untiring efforts for the cause of civil rights, much ground was covered on the road from Montgomery in 1955 to Memphis in 1968 where Dr. King was cut down by an assassin's bullet. In Dr. King's words,

It is a road over which millions of Negroes are traveling to find a new sense of dignity. It will, I am convinced, be widened into a superhighway of justice.

Dr. King was constantly aware that danger and violence lurked along that road, but he dedicated and finally gave his life to the journey. In his book, "Why We Can't Wait," written in 1964, Dr. King penned a prophetic passage which today stands as a tribute to his own efforts:

The Negro was willing to risk martyrdom in order to move and stir the social conscience of his community and the nation . . . he would force his oppressor to commit his brutality openly, with the rest of the world looking on.

Dr. King was a student of Gandhi and Christ, and as such, was a true believer in the combined powers of love and non-violent civil disobedience. His tactics succeeded in stirring the social conscience

and producing the great civil rights legislation of the last two decades. In Dr. King's words:

Nonviolent action, the Negro saw, was the way to supplement, not replace, the process of change. It was the way to divest himself of passivity without arraying himself in vindictive force.

Ironically, Dr. King's death gave way to a brief outbreak of violence and civil disorder in our country, a surface manifestation of a continuing malaise of racial frustration, bitterness, and despair. Following those disorders, the Kerner Commission was to warn that:

Our Nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal.

It is clear, now nearly 5 years after Dr. King's death, that much ground remains to be covered on that long journey begun with the Emancipation Proclamation, and that the final chapter is far from being completed.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the anniversary of Dr. King's birth, let us rededicate ourselves to making that dream which he so eloquently enunciated a reality; let us recommit ourselves to completing that journey and struggle for equality and freedom for all our citizens. For as Dr. King said:

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

What we are really talking about is the realization of the American dream for all Americans. There could be no more fitting tribute to the life and works of Dr. King than to achieve that goal as this Nation prepares to celebrate its own 200th birthday.

RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, I introduced a resolution of inquiry directing the President and the Secretary of Defense to inform this body on the extent of the bombing of North Vietnam. On Thursday, January 11, I reintroduced that resolution. This step is necessary in order to make language changes in the text of the resolution as advised by the Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler. The substance of the resolution is no different from that of the earlier version, but these changes have been made to assure that the resolution will not be subject to a point of order when it reaches the floor of the House. It is imperative that the House take the opportunity to debate this important subject and work its will on the substance of the resolution. We must not be thwarted by technical procedural points which are basically irrelevant to the importance of the information we seek from the administration.

There are four changes in the text of the resolution:

First. It will not be directed to the President, but is now limited in its application to the Secretary of Defense.

Second. The final paragraph of the earlier version has been omitted. That paragraph referred to estimate of the damage inflicted on North Vietnam, and particularly to "after action reports."

These two changes have been required to avoid the argument that requiring information from the President, and about the hurt to Hanoi, involves the conduct of foreign relations. Apparently, it has been the practice to make a resolution of inquiry discretionary when the resolution involves information on this subject to be supplied by the President. I do not subscribe to the position that American bombing of the north is such an essential part of our foreign policy that information on the damage we have caused cannot be told to the Congress. However, I wanted to be sure that the resolution did not depend on the discretion of the administration official to whom it was directed, and that information about the extent of our commitment to the bombing be disclosed. Obviously, the cost of this operation will have to be borne by all of us, and will be the subject of debate when the necessary funding resolutions are before us. We must have this information in order to participate in that debate in an informed way.

Third. The language of paragraph (5) has been changed to require the Secretary of Defense to produce documents giving estimates, as contrasted with simple estimates. This is a language change we have made to avoid the argument that the resolution is requiring research or conclusions based on research, and thus avoids a possible point of order on that ground. The change is not a change of substance.

Fourth. The date of the period for which the information is requested has been extended to January 10, 1973—one additional week—because there have been some reports that the bombing is still continuing.

I regret the necessity for these changes. The first three have been made purely for procedural reasons, and are good illustrations of the kind of technicalities we face when we propose to debate a subject of such paramount importance as the bombing of the north. Now, I have been assured by the Parliamentarian that the resolution is free of procedural defects, and that we will indeed have the opportunity to consider the resolution on the floor.

The resolution has been cosponsored by the following members:

MS. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, and Mr. BURTON.

Mr. CLAY, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. REES, and Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WOLFF.

The text of the revised resolution is printed below:

H. RES. 26

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives within ten days after the adoption of this resolution the following data:

(1) The number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, over North Vietnam during the period December 17, 1972, through January 10, 1973.

(2) The tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped on North Vietnam during the period December 17, 1972, through January 10, 1973.

(3) The number and nomenclature of airplanes lost by the United States over North Vietnam or its territorial waters during the period December 17, 1972, through January 10, 1973.

(4) The number of members of the Armed Forces of the United States killed, wounded, captured, or missing in action while participating in flights over North Vietnam during the period December 17, 1972, through January 10, 1973.

(5) Documents giving the best available estimate of casualties incurred by the North Vietnamese during the period December 17, 1972, through January 10, 1973.

(6) The cost incurred by the United States as a result of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over North Vietnam during the period December 17, 1972, through January 10, 1973, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes during such period, salaries of U.S. military personnel, during such period, involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, cost of equipment destroyed or damaged while participating in bombing missions over North Vietnam, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling, during the period December 17, 1972, through January 10, 1973.

SOVIET POLITICAL REPRESSION THROUGH PSYCHIATRY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, while the innocent, the naive, and well-meaning in the West continue to speak of détente and of an "era of negotiation" with the Soviet Union, untold numbers of brave men and women languish in Soviet prisons and psychiatric hospitals for no reason other than their expression of "unpopular" opinions.

In September 1972 one man who managed to leave the Soviet Union after several experiences in such psychiatric hospitals, the distinguished mathematician Alexander Yesenin-Volpin, testified about his experiences before the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. An important document containing this testimony and other previously unpublished material has recently been issued by the committee, entitled "Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Repression in the Soviet Union."

Dr. Yesenin-Volpin pointed out that although his mathematical work was well recognized, in the West as well as in his

own country, he could never rise above the rank of junior researcher at the All Russian Institute. His superiors told him that:

While you continue your obscure social activity you will never be a senior researcher.

He asked:

Is such discrimination in the Soviet Union possible?

He was told that not only is it possible, but someone conducting "anti-Soviet activity" could be put in jail.

What was Dr. Yessenin-Volpin's "anti-Soviet activity?" He objected to the arrest of distinguished academicians who had called for human rights. For this "crime" he was declared insane, and sent to a mental institution.

Any imprisoned person may be sentenced to a psychiatric hospital in absentia. No procedural rights are granted to a person who is declared insane and, therefore, not responsible for his actions. Dr. Yessenin-Volpin was one of the lucky ones. Ninety-five of his colleagues sent a letter protesting his incarceration. As a result of this pressure he was eventually released and, in effect, expelled from the country.

In an article published in the New York Times of December 9, 1972, Dr. Yessenin-Volpin tells part of his story. He notes that:

I have met or known of hundreds of individuals who were sane in the opinion of relatives, friends, and colleagues, and yet these persons were confined against their will in Soviet mental institutions. Vladimir Bukovsky sent to the West documented case histories of Grigorenko, Yakhimovich, Gorbenevskaya, Fainberg, Borisov, and Kuznetsov.

He concludes his article by appealing:

For adoption of an international code of ethics to prevent misuse of involuntary psychiatric confinement for political or other nonmedical purposes.

I wish to share this important article with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

The article follows:

THE MEDICAL POLICE

(By Alexander Volpin)

My personal experience enables me to understand a serious danger threatening many Soviet intellectuals. Five times I was confined against my will in psychiatric institutions in the U.S.S.R. In 1949 I was arrested for the first time; certain poems I had written and recited to friends were considered anti-Soviet. Arrested in Chernovits, interrogated in Moscow's Lubyanka Prison, sent to the Serbsky Institute for psychiatric examination, I was then held in Leningrad Prison Psychiatric Hospital for a year before being banished to Karaganda. Under Stalin, confinement in a mental hospital probably saved me, as well as others, from the worse fate of long terms in labor camps.

Leningrad Hospital had a prison regime with severe discipline and military guards; many doctors wore M.G.B. insignia. The patient was a creature without any rights whatsoever, even the right to possess matches or writing materials. Now such institutions are no longer designated prison hospitals but instead special hospitals, and some changes in regime have been introduced. In one respect the situation of inmates has become worse—

in 1950 "political patients" were isolated; now they share common wards with murderers, thieves and seriously disturbed patients.

During the Khrushchev period I was confined three times in psychiatric hospitals: once for advising a Frenchwoman against accepting Soviet citizenship, once for failure to inform on an acquaintance who had allegedly engaged in treasonable activities, and once for my refusal to denounce American publication of my book, "A Leaf of Spring," and my assertion of the right of everyone to leave any country. In 1968 I was confined again after applying to the American Embassy for the necessary visa to accept an invitation to lecture in Buffalo.

During my confinements no serious attempt was made to treat me for mental illness. In 1960 I received small doses of reserpine (12 tablets in a four-month period). Another time a friendly psychiatrist helped me avoid treatment with halperidol, a drug reputed to cause extreme restlessness and temporary or possibly permanent disorientation.

Since the law sets no limit to a patient's confinement, the threat of days, years or even your whole life passing in emptiness is keenly felt. In practice, an inmate's discharge primarily depends on his willingness to admit his "errors," to acknowledge the "correctness" of his treatment and to promise "improvement" in his future behavior.

I write about my case only to rouse world public opinion to aid those still confined in special psychiatric hospitals for their political opinions or "reformist tendencies"—men like Peter Grigorenko, Victor Fainberg, Vladimir Borisov and Vladimir Gershuni. Perhaps public outcry can help these victims gain their freedom; perhaps it can dissuade the Soviet authorities from using psychiatric confinement as a weapon to suppress dissent when trials are inconvenient for the regime. Only a month ago, on Nov. 2, my wife, Irina Kristi, was put in Kaschenko mental hospital because of her efforts to attend the trial of her friend Kronid Lyubarsky; fortunately, Irina was released on Nov. 29 after the intervention of Academician Sakharov.

I have met or know of hundreds of individuals who were sane in the opinion of relatives, friends and colleagues, and yet these persons were confined against their will in Soviet mental institutions. Vladimir Bukovsky sent to the West documented case histories of Grigorenko, Yakhimovich, Gorbenevskaya, Fainberg, Borisov and Kuznetsov. After studying these reports, a group of British and European psychiatrists felt "impelled to express grave doubts about the legitimacy of the treatment for the six people concerned and indefinite detention in prison mental hospital conditions. It seems to us that the diagnoses on the six above-mentioned people were made purely in consequence of actions in which they were exercising fundamental freedoms—as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution." (Bukovsky has since been sentenced to seven years' imprisonment and five years' exile for "anti-Soviet slanders.")

My personal experience permits me to speak of the situation only in the U.S.S.R., but I have read about violations of the civil rights of mental patients in other countries.

I appeal for adoption of an international code of ethics to prevent misuse of involuntary psychiatric confinement for political or other nonmedical purposes. I also appeal for creation of a permanent international commission composed of qualified psychiatrists and jurists and empowered to investigate alleged abuses of involuntary psychiatric confinement wherever they occur.

PRAIRIE FARMER—OUTSTANDING JOURNALISTIC STATESMANSHIP

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding example of journalistic statesmanship appears in the January 20 issue of the *Prairie Farmer* magazine, the most widely circulated and respected farm journal published in Illinois.

Its editor, James C. Thomson, wrote clearly and with refreshing candor in general support of the economy measures just announced by the Department of Agriculture.

In an era in which most commentators to special interest groups seem invariably to reflect a bias, the following editorial deserves special attention and applause:

LET THE ECONOMY AX FALL FAIRLY ON ALL PROGRAMS

Not unexpectedly, an economy wave has hit federal farm programs. Reaction has ranged from apathy to deep shock.

The soil conservation pollution control program ACP-REAP has been terminated. REA's subsidized 2% loans have been boosted to 5%. Farm disaster 40-year subsidized loans went from 1% to 5%. And \$5000 disaster giveaways to individuals were ended. Subsidized grain storage loans also have been lopped off.

The Nixon-Butz administration saved \$800 million in farm program costs as a result of massive grain exports. They hope to save another \$800 million with cutbacks in crop control programs.

No one could make such wide-ranging changes without incurring the wrath of countless thousands who depend on these programs for their livelihood. Few are farmers.

Predictably, spokesmen for the Farm Coalition (Grange, NFU, NFO) denounced some or all of the economy moves. The president of the National Limestone Institute called the termination of REAP "the worst boner."

Surprisingly, the American Farm Bureau Federation backed away from full endorsement of REAP termination. The AFBF has been critical of REAP for years and joined every president since Harry Truman in trying to kill it, only to be thwarted by Congress. This could happen again.

Few will find fault with soil conservation, pollution control, tiling, and the use of limestone. And who will object to the principle of cost sharing for the control of erosion and pollution on the farm?

Obviously everyone benefits from measures necessary to protect the soil, our most precious resource. All should share in the cost.

When low-cost REA 2% loans were started during the depression average interest costs were 1.69%. They are now between 6% and 7%. Certainly the rural electric co-ops have done a heroic job of bringing electricity to farmers.

But we should not lose sight of the fact that only 20% of rural electric co-op customers are farmers. Nearly all of the new customers being hooked up are nonfarmers.

But the realm of welfare most difficult to understand is that of the declared disaster area. Washington actually gave away \$80 million in \$5000 handouts in 1972.

The program expanded so fast that if Secretary Butz hadn't killed it they would have been giving away \$800 million this year. Even a millionaire, Butz said, could have qualified

for a \$5000 handout and a 1% loan for 40 years.

These are certainly not the most pressing priorities we face. The overriding issue is the containment of the cruel pressures of inflation that sent farm costs zooming 45% from 1965 to 1972.

Belatedly, President Nixon recognizes the need for action. He has called for a federal spending ceiling of \$250 billion. Even with this ceiling we can expect to chalk up another \$25-billion deficit.

Congress has failed miserably to meet courageously the challenge of fiscal responsibility. In fact, some congressmen already are planning, perhaps willfully, to breach the \$250-billion spending ceiling even if they have to go to court to do it.

Many farmers, including NFO leaders, have told us over the years that the best farm program is simply higher income. "With better income," they have said, "you can scrap all farm programs."

That stage may be close. The year 1972 set an all-time record \$19-billion farm income.

Only about 13% of the nation's farmers participate in REAP. With cost sharing, they carry about 70% of the cost. The federal government pays the other 30%.

Payments to the farmer averaged about \$230. On that basis the program hardly seems worth fighting for, in view of the human suspicion that it is just another handout to farmers.

If farmers were the only group expected to suffer drastic cutbacks in federal programs, we would be tempted to say forget it. But Secretary Butz assures us cuts in agriculture will be matched with cuts in all lines of government spending.

We hesitate to argue over the priorities involved in these economy measures. Something nice can be said about all federal subsidy programs.

No one wants to be accused of shooting Santa Claus. But the fact remains that federal spending is now beyond a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Perhaps there are other areas where economies can be made. Few seem bothered by the fact that nearly every federal program must have an expensive bureaucracy to administer it.

Not all counties have offices for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and Soil Conservation Service.

But enough consolidation could be engineered in these county offices to save the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars. More than 85% of the USDA personnel is not in Washington, but largely in offices that duplicate each other throughout the country.

Basically, the economy moves of the administration are commendable. They are overdue and should be expanded if possible.

Agriculture has much to gain from cost and price stability. This stability can be attained only thru less spending or higher taxes.

Our choice is less spending. So let the economy ax fall where it will provided it falls across the board, hacking away at all federal programs as well as agriculture. Those who say no should then in complete candor recommend substantially higher taxes.

A \$25 TAX DEDUCTION FOR BLOOD DONATIONS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my col-

leagues a bill, H.R. 700, to give a \$25 tax deduction for a pint of blood donated to a nonprofit collecting agency. This measure has 27 cosponsors, and is designed to provide the public with an added incentive to donate blood to these organizations.

Over the recent holiday period, according to the New York Times, areas from Los Angeles to New York City have been hit by a severe blood shortage. A great deal of elective surgery has been postponed. And, in case of catastrophes such as an airplane or a bus crash, local blood supplies could become exhausted. Over the New Year's weekend 2,100 people, myself included, gave blood in New York City because of the emergency. But, we must deal with the blood need not as an emergency, but as an everyday affairs. This problem exists because only a small fraction of American voluntarily donate blood regularly.

Blood has become a form of medicine, that is particularly important to most sick patients in our hospitals. But patients in need of blood transfusions now face two dangers: the unavailability of blood and the infusion into hospital blood banks of hepatitis-contaminated blood. Presently only 3 percent of the public donates blood through nonprofit organizations such as the Red Cross. If we can just increase this by 1 percent, the blood shortage problem will be eliminated. My bill would improve both the quantity and quality of blood available to patients. It would provide up to \$125 in deductions for an individual per year, for a maximum of 5 pints of blood. This would provide the necessary incentive to add the needed number of donors to the rolls. This incentive is directed at the blue and white collar workers who can benefit from a tax deduction at the end of the year, and not to the derelict attracted to the commercial blood banks for a quick buck.

While most people view donating blood as a charitable contribution the Internal Revenue Service recognizes blood donations as a service, which is not deductible, rather than property which is. While someone can take a tax deduction for a \$25 monetary contribution to the American Red Cross, he cannot take a deduction for the pint of blood he gives to the Red Cross. But, what greater personal property could a person give than this blood to save the life of another. For someone who is dying, a pint of blood is much more important than \$25 in case donated to the American Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues, and I hope the Departments of HEW and Treasury will give this favorable consideration.

A list of cosponsors follows:

Edward Koch, Bella Abzug, Joseph Adabbo, Jonathan Bingham, John Buchanan, James Burke, Phillip Burton, Robert W. Daniel.

Hamilton Fish, L. H. Fountain, Gilbert Gude, Michael Harrington, Henry Helstoski, Norman Lent, Patsy Mink, John Moakley.

James O'Hara, Bertram Podell, Charles Rangel, Ronald Sarasin, James Symington, Steve Symms, Robert Tiernan, and Antonio Borja Won Pat.

NETTIE DROSEHN

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in this age of uniformity and sameness, Nettie Drosehn was a unique and lovely person. A resident of Hinsdale, Mass., in the beautiful Berkshire Hills, Nettie was a farmer first, then, in her later years, a commentator on the world at large.

She had a gift for making friends and her many acts of kindness, to her neighbors and strangers alike, is legendary. Nettie died in November and was mourned by a large circle of friends and admirers.

In order that my colleagues might share in the knowledge of who Mrs. Nettie Drosehn was and what she meant to the people who reside in the rolling hills of western Massachusetts, I include in the RECORD the following articles which appeared in the Berkshire Eagle.

The articles follow:

Mrs. NETTIE DROSEHN, 87, DIES AT FARM IN HINSDALE

Mrs. Nettie Drosehn, one of Berkshire County's best known philosopher-farmers, died yesterday at her farmhouse on Smith Road, Hinsdale. She was 87.

Mrs. Drosehn—she was called Nettie by all hands—worked and talked on equal levels with the male animal long before the age of Women's Lib.

Although she had not actively worked the farm after a son, James, died in 1962, she still tended the flower gardens and always kept the door open for those who would stop to chat about the weather or politics.

Nettie befriended many a "foreigner" who had moved into the hilltown section from other parts. It was difficult, if not impossible to leave Nettie without the gift of a pound of homemade butter or a dozen eggs, sometimes both.

NEVER EMPTY-HANDED

As one of her sons Bill recalled today, "No one ever walked away empty-handed or with an empty belly. The coffee pot and soup kettle were on the stove 24 hours a day."

Mrs. Drosehn, the former Nettie Landau, came from German and Irish stock and was born in Bethlehem, N.Y. She and her husband, Frederick F., who died in 1958 at the age of 83, met in 1904 in Lenox where she was the cook at Mahanna's Brickyard and he was the foreman.

The brickyard closed that year and they went to Haynes Falls, N.Y., where Mr. Drosehn went into lumbering and Nettie became the cook for the crew. They were married there Dec. 21, 1904. They moved to Hinsdale in June 1905 and started their life of farming.

In their early life they had a working dairy, chicken and produce farm, but in the 1920s got rid of most of the dairy herd.

SHE DROVE A TEAM

Nettie could drive a team of horses as well as any man and better than most. In her early days in Hinsdale part of her daily work involved driving a team through the hills of Peru, Windsor and Hinsdale collecting cream from the farms and delivering it to the Hinsdale Creamery on Creamery Road off Maple Street in Hinsdale.

She never drove a car or a tractor, but could plow a straight furrow behind a pair of working horses. Her physical strength was

legendary and she was proud to be known as the "Amazon of the Berkshires."

Around the farm she wore men's shoes, a simple farm dress and, if the weather demanded it, a man's sweater. On visits to town of Pittsfield, she would switch to a plain long coat, a dark dress and a black, wide-brimmed straw hat. The hat will be buried with her.

A LETTER WRITER

Nettle was as proud of the Berkshire Hills as though they were her invention. But she allowed a few other people to take a bit of the credit. One of those was the late Kelton B. Miller, founder of The Eagle.

In past years she was a frequent writer of letters to the editor. More recently, she had to put the pen aside, but she replaced this with almost daily calls to radio talk shows and would offer comments on the weather and whatever else might be the subject of conversation for the day.

She is survived by five sons, Frank W. of Southwick, and William A., George F., Winthrop C. and Edwin C., all of Hinsdale; three daughters, Mrs. Jennie Steele of Dalton, Mrs. Alicia M. Pelkey of Hinsdale and Mrs. Annie E. Sanders of Westfield; a brother, James Landau of Albany, N.Y., 28 grandchildren, 43 great-grandchildren, and two great-great-grandchildren.

SERVICES WEDNESDAY

She had lived alone at the farm since the death of her son James, but two grandsons stayed with her nights.

Mrs. Drosehn belonged to the Hinsdale Congregational Church.

Friends may call at the Bartlett-Wellington Funeral Home in Dalton tonight from 7 to 9 and tomorrow from 2 to 4 and 7 to 9.

Services will be Wednesday at 11 at the funeral home, followed by burial in South Cemetery, Peru.

OUR BERKSHIRES

(By Theodore Giddings)

Nettle Drosehn, 87, whose funeral services were Wednesday, will be remembered not only for her rugged but kindly character but also for her love of nature and the outdoor life. The last time we saw her was several years ago when, in the company of "Pete" Miller, *Eagle* editor, we stopped to chat in her farmyard. She called our attention to an English sparrow perched atop the nearby barn.

"Want me to call him?" she asked.

When we both said "sure," she whistled, and the bird came flying over and lighted on her shoulder.

"He's my pal," she explained. "He fell out of the nest and broke his wing. I put him in a box near the stove, fed him and nursed him along until he was able to fly off. But he doesn't want to leave me. He keeps flying back."

And no wonder. Who could forget such a friendly soul.

LIBERAL LEFT INCAPABLE OF ADMITTING MISTAKES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the election is well behind us, objective commentaries on the American political scene are certainly in order. One column that qualifies for a description of objectivity was carried by the New World

on December 1, 1972, and was written by Father Andrew M. Greeley:

LIBERAL LEFT INCAPABLE OF ADMITTING MISTAKES

(By Father Andrew M. Greeley)

The liberal-left is busy trying to fashion an explanation for the terrible drubbing it took in the presidential election. Characteristically, it is absolutely incapable of admitting it made any mistakes.

McGovern political advisor Frank Mankiewicz, for example, blames "Hubert Humphrey, Arthur Bremmer and Thomas Eagleton." Senator McGovern blames the "Wallace vote," and many of the "liberal" commentators and columnists echo this claim.

Anthony Lewis, whose column in the New York Times is usually an accurate reflection of what the lemming liberals (to use Richard Scammon's word) are saying at their cocktail parties, suggests grimly that the election was a victory for crypto-racism.

As usual, the ideological liberals show that they can't count. Undoubtedly, Mr. Nixon picked up many Wallace voters in the South, but in the North in 1963, Wallace got only about 6% of the vote. If Wallace had run it is doubtful that a single important state would have changed from the Nixon to the McGovern column.

The Wallace vote—even if it all went to Nixon—still was not needed in states like New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan and California.

Furthermore, if all of the 1968 Wallace voters had cast their ballots for Nixon and were then disqualified on the grounds that Wallace voters have no right to vote for anyone else, Nixon's lead would have been 11 percentage points. However, not all the Wallace votes went for Nixon, though we will have to wait detailed survey analysis to know exactly what happened. But let us go through the exercise of subtracting the Wallace margin from Nixon's plurality.

If five-sixths of the Wallace votes went to Nixon and one-sixth to McGovern, Nixon's net advantage would have been 8 percentage points. Eight from 23 gives him a 15 percentage point non-Wallace margin.

If three-fourths of the Wallace vote went to the President, he would have picked up a net gain of 6 percentage points, leaving him a 17 point non-Wallace margin. If he received two-thirds of the Wallace vote, his net gain would have been 4 percentage points, and his non-Wallace advantage would have been 19 points.

This is a simple exercise in arithmetic.

If the liberals won't engage in it, the reason probably is that if you are superior to other human beings intellectually and morally, you don't have to be able to add and subtract.

And what about the charge of racism? Undoubtedly, some racists voted for Nixon. (Undoubtedly, some anti-ethnic racists with Ph.D.s voted for McGovern.) But that Nixon's 20 million vote margin was entirely racist is nothing more than an unproven act of faith.

One of my university colleagues assured that it was a "backlash" election and that Nixon, Hitler-like, had appealed to the hatreds of the American people. I told him he might be right, but there was nothing in the empirical data to indicate a strong backlash.

On the contrary, I suggested, all the evidence indicated that racist attitudes were rapidly waning in America. His reply was that all the data proved was that Americans were becoming clever at lying about their racism.

This man is a very distinguished social scientist. His whole career has been devoted to testing assumptions against empirical evidence. He was not making an assertion for which there was no empirical evidence and for which there never can be

any. Such faith, one supposes, is touching, but it doesn't have much to do with science or politics.

Why are liberals like Mr. Lewis and my colleague so eager to fantasize about a racist population? (They usually drop the busing argument when you point out that almost half the blacks in the country are against it, too.)

It is not merely that most liberals are too intellectually arrogant to admit that they might have made mistakes and that they might have totally misunderstood what was going on in the country.

More important, perhaps, is the liberal's need to feel morally superior. Ignorant and uninformed people have beaten him in an election. He is angry, bitter, frustrated. Why have they not recognized his superior intelligence? Why have they not granted him the power of government to which his obvious excellence entitles him?

The poor, stupid fools have in effect denied his intellectual brilliance. What else does he have left besides his moral superiority? At least they cannot take that away from him.

So on to 1976 and another disaster.

JUVENILE JUSTICE IN MISSOURI

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, my Youth Advisory Council is now in its second year of study and action, and it continues to demonstrate the value of participation by young people in the governmental process. I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues one area in which the council has been especially active and influential.

In the fall of 1971, the council committee on justice began studying the system of juvenile justice in Missouri. The committee made numerous visits to juvenile facilities and institutions in the State, interviewed police and juvenile court personnel, and not with administrators, staff members, and inmates of juvenile institutions.

The committee in 1972 released a report calling for the creation of a "Missouri Department of Youth Services" to be responsible for seeing that young people in the State are provided with the services they need.

Just last month the chairman of the committee, Douglas Phillips, was invited to testify before the Missouri Senate-House Committee on Children and Youth. Today I wish to share with you excerpts from Doug's testimony:

Our study has . . . good place to begin.

I believe these recommendations ought to receive earnest and favorable consideration:

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Our study has led us to the same conclusions that have been reached separately by others: that, all too often, the so-called juvenile justice system is unhelpful to juveniles, unsystematic, and unjust.

We suggest three steps toward bringing about a condition of justice.

The first step should be to improve the juvenile justice system itself. Throughout the

entire process, every young person should be treated individually and in his community, or as close to it as possible. Rather than funneling all offenders, each of whom has a separate set of problems, into a single form of treatment, numerous treatment options should be made available to every offender, and a personal plan of treatment should be determined for him and carried out.

The second step should be to place greater emphasis on the prevention of juvenile delinquency, and on the diversion of youth from the juvenile justice system. Services should be made available to the so-called pre-delinquents—children and youth who are on the verge of serious trouble but who have not yet passed the crucial turning point. It is evident that once a person enters the system, it is difficult for him to get out.

The need for these first two steps has been recognized by many people, including several witnesses at this hearing. But we have sensed a tendency, among some, to want to stop after these steps.

We fully support these two steps, but we also believe that a third step is needed: a Department of Youth Services should be created to guarantee services to all youth who need them.

Across the nation, there is talk of the so-called Youth Services Bureau, a community agency to divert youth from the juvenile justice system and deal with pre-delinquents. In Missouri, the Juvenile Delinquency Task Force has proposed a Division of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Services, to be responsible for prevention and treatment of delinquency.

The term "youth services," as used in Youth Services Bureau and Division of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Services, is a euphemism—or shall we say a "youth-emism." It does not mean "services for youth." It does not mean "services for youth who need them." It means "services for delinquent and pre-delinquent youth." Youth services might include delinquency services, but we emphasize: they are not the same thing.

Most young people are not delinquents. Most young people are not pre-delinquents. Most young people do have definite needs that could be satisfied with the right kind of services. For example, according to one study, 80% of the high school age youth in the inner city of St. Louis (the city, the area east of Grand) tried to get summer jobs last year and could not get them—80%. This shows a clear need for job training and job placement services.

The third step, the step we advocate, is to create a genuine youth services system. How can we not take that step? Is it right to ignore the needs of youth who do not happen to demonstrate their needs by going around and mugging people? Is youth development just a cheap way of preventing crime? Or is the sound development of young people an end in itself—and a means toward producing a better quality of life in our society?

A Department of Youth Services—not a bureaucratic substructure in another department, but a separate and distinct Department of Youth Services—would be responsible for seeing that the needs of all youth are met to the greatest extent possible. It would be a department for youth and of youth, in which youth would share in shaping policy and purpose.

The department would not, of course, deliver all the services itself. In some cases, all it would need to do is make people aware of services that are already available. A recent study showed that one third of all the youth in the St. Louis area were unaware of existing, available summer recreation programs in their communities last year. In other cases, the department would stimulate communities to fill gaps in services, and give them assistance in providing services.

The department would be responsible for all youth services, including delinquency services. It would de-segregate, de-stigmatize, and humanize delinquency treatment services.

One final word: our recommended department may extend beyond the existing conception of the juvenile justice system. But we ask: if there is to be a condition of justice, is it not necessary that there be equality of opportunity? And isn't opportunity for young people a good place to begin?

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our recently retired colleague and dear friend, the Honorable William M. McCulloch of Ohio, has been honored by the College of Law of Ohio State University with a special citation as a distinguished alumnus. I know my colleagues will applaud this well-deserved tribute to Bill McCulloch and I insert the text of his citation:

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

Presented to William M. McCulloch in appreciation of the credit and esteem he has brought to The Ohio State University College of Law during his distinguished career of dedicated public service.

He will retire from the Congress of the United States after thirty-seven years of fruitful endeavors in high offices of the State of Ohio and the United States.

He graduated from the College in 1925, established himself in the private practice of law in Piqua, Ohio, and then was elected to six terms in the Ohio House of Representatives, serving as Speaker for three terms and Minority Leader for two terms.

He served in the United States Army as a Captain in Military Government during World War II, exercising command over that portion of the city of Paris, France, which included the Eiffel Tower and the Chamber of Deputies.

He was elected in 1947 to the first of thirteen consecutive terms in the United States House of Representatives and began a career of congressional leadership and legislative craftsmanship matched by few in our Nation's history.

He served as ranking Republican member of the House Judiciary Committee during one of its most productive periods. Working harmoniously with Chairman Emanuel Celler, his leadership helped to produce much major legislation affecting the federal courts, antitrust regulation, electoral reform and other areas of vital national concern. He personally made possible the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, 1965 and 1968 by conciliating various proposals for reform, drafting and redrafting the results and enlisting essential bipartisan support. Of his role in the civil rights legislative struggle, it has been justifiably written that "constitutional and human rights were more important than normal political advantage."

His constructive approach to national problems won him the trust and confidence of presidents of both major political parties. President Eisenhower appointed him to the Commission on Government Security and President Johnson named him to both the Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and

the National Advisory Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Both the substance of the law and the administration of justice have been immeasurably advanced by his work and his career stands as a noble exemplar to all who would use the law as an instrument of human progress. For his service to his profession, his State and his Nation; for his rare combination of qualities of intellect, statesmanship and unselfish service; and for the honor and pride he has brought to The Ohio State University College of Law, he shall henceforth be known as one of its graduates who bears the title "Distinguished Alumnus."

Dated this twentieth day of October, A.D. 1972.

JAMES C. KIRBY, Jr.,

Dean, the College of Law of the Ohio State University.

DAVID R. FULLMER,

Chairman, National Council of the College of Law of the Ohio State University.

THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in the 92d Congress, the question of organizing programs and services for very young children received considerable attention. Although comprehensive child development programs were never finally enacted, it was impossible to ignore the ever-increasing percent of mothers of preschoolers who are entering or remaining in the workforce. With or without Federal legislation, their children will have to be cared for.

While we all hope that the personnel providing this care will be able to recognize and respond appropriately to the needs of each child, we also realize that to require child care programs to be staffed exclusively with degree holding professionals would be prohibitively expensive and wasteful of scarce professional resources. It is no surprise, therefore, that the initiation of a new mid-level child caretaker, the Child Development Associate, CDA, has been met with enthusiasm and hope.

I insert into the RECORD a speech made in December by Raymond Collins, of HEW's Office of Child Development. In it, he describes the rationale, development, and current status of the child development associate program. The speech follows:

CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE

(By Raymond S. Collins)

Today, I want to talk with you about a new profession, the Child Development Associate. The Child Development Associate or CDA, as it is popularly called, reflects a new approach to the career preparation and credentialing of child care staff.

WHAT IS A CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE (CDA)?

The CDA is defined as a person with the basic competencies to assume primary responsibility for the education and development of preschool children. The CDA will be able to take full charge of the daily activities of a group of young children in a day

care center, Head Start program, private nursery school or other preschool program.

The CDA will be radically different from existing types of child care workers. At present, one of two extremes tends to exist: either the person in charge of the children's activities has a college degree (not necessarily including training in early childhood development), or, more commonly, the person meets no specific standards related to the quality of developmental care they are able to provide.

This situation merits serious concern in light of a growing recognition that a college degree (by itself) is no guarantee that a person can provide quality care, coupled with heightened awareness of the importance of the first years of life.

The significance of early development is now well established. Critical changes in the child's cognitive growth, physical and mental health, and social-emotional development occur during infancy and the preschool period. Parents exert the major influence on the child during this period, and we are seeking ways to enhance the parental role through projects like Home Start.

If the child is in a Head Start, day care, or other preschool program, the "teacher", or whoever has charge of the daily activities, is the key determinant of program quality. This principal staff person—and the quality of her skills, experience, and training—tends to have a greater impact on the child than the type of curriculum offered or any other program characteristic.

It is not the "teacher's" or care giver's level of general education that seems to make a difference, but rather the nature and quality of her career preparation.

Staff without degrees, who have had training in early childhood development, generally stimulate greater gains in young children than those who have the formal degrees but lack training in the specific competencies.

These research and evaluation findings, although still somewhat preliminary, reflect common sense. There is no reason to believe that courses in ancient history, calculus, or political science—however worthwhile in their own right—better equip someone to foster learning and social-emotional development in a four-year-old.

The CDA concept is built around the basic competencies that are believed to make a difference in a comprehensive development program for preschoolers. These competencies fall in six areas and require that the Child Development Associate have the knowledge and skills to:

1. Set up a safe and healthy learning environment;
2. Advance physical and intellectual competence;
3. Build positive self-concept and individual strength;
4. Organize and sustain the positive functioning of children and adults in a group in a learning environment;
5. Bring about optimal coordination of home and center child-rearing practices and expectations; and
6. Carry out supplementary responsibilities related to the children's programs.

These competencies take into account the need for the CDA to be able to individualize the program for each child; to be sensitive to racial/ethnic and cultural uniqueness; and to recognize special needs in health or other areas that require professional attention.

Even a CDA with these competencies is not expected to "go it alone." A paraprofessional aide should be on hand to assist with the children. Volunteer help may further augment the adult-child ratio so essential to a quality program. A "Master Teacher," or other senior professional, who possesses both advanced degrees and extensive training in early childhood development, should be avail-

able as a resource person. The "Master Teacher" should assist in such areas as curriculum planning and the continuing professional development of the CDA. On a day-to-day basis, the CDA would have complete charge of the center classroom and the children's activities.

KEY FEATURES OF THE CDA PROJECT

There are two key aspects of the CDA project in this first year of pilot operations. First, 10-15 pilot training projects will be funded in late December to provide competency-based CDA training. Second, the Child Development Associate Consortium, a newly created private non-profit corporation, will have the responsibility for the assessment and credentialing of CDAs. The Consortium will also refine and field test the basic competencies which were developed under the auspices of the Office of Child Development.

CDA PILOT TRAINING

In an overwhelming expression of interest in the CDA program, over 250 institutions submitted synopses despite the limited funds available for pilot projects. Roughly one-third of the applicants had some community college, junior college or technical institute involvement, often in cooperation with a Head Start or day care center. Other applicants included universities, child care facilities, state departments of education, community-based private non-profit corporations, and a variety of other groups interested in training and child care. The diversity of training institutions can, in part, be attributed to a requirement in the pilot guidelines that 50 percent of the training must be field-based in an actual child care center.

Some of the training synopses submitted by community colleges included such features as:

- Formation of laboratory-type child care centers within the school;
- Coordination with Head Start, Model Cities and day care programs for field placement;
- Community advisory boards with representation of parents and students;
- Coordination with other resources agencies including State Departments of Education, public schools and Welfare Departments;
- Incentives for adults, for example; mothers of growing children, to return to school;
- Innovative plans to modify course offerings to provide training in specific competencies;
- Efforts to provide field experiences and on going counseling and assessment to trainees;
- Linkages with universities in such areas as assessment, materials development, continuing degree-oriented training, and evaluation; and

Granting an Associate Arts degree for successfully completing CDA training.

Seventy institutions, including a sizeable number of community colleges, were asked to develop full proposals based on the merits of their synopses. Roughly a dozen pilot projects will be funded to begin operations in January 1973.

It is expected that CDA training will take up to two years, depending on the individual's prior experience and skills. Pilot projects, accordingly, will generally operate at least two years.

CDA CONSORTIUM

The CDA Consortium will mount a series of parallel pilot projects, closely coordinated with the training pilots, to develop the assessment and credentialing system. The Consortium expects to have at least a prototype credentialing system in operation by July 1973.

The CDA Consortium is composed of organizations and individuals concerned with quality care for preschool children and the career preparation of child development staff. The Consortium was formed in June 1972 and received a grant from the Office of Child Development to initiate its activities.

Over 25 organizations have been invited to

join the Consortium, and most are now participating. These include such groups as the American Association of Elementary Kindergarten and Nursery Educators; the Association for Childhood Education International; the National Association for the Education of Young Children; the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children; the National Indian Education Advisory Council; the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education; the Association of Teacher Educators; National Parents Federation; National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification; Education Commission of the States, etc. Provision is made for future participation of CDA trainees.

AACJC was one of the organizations invited to join, but it declined citing technical complications in its by-laws. However, AACJC has been very supportive in offering continuing assistance and attending Consortium meetings in an observer status.

The effectiveness of the CDA Consortium will depend on its ability to establish a consensus among a broad spectrum of groups regarding acceptance of nontraditional approaches to the career preparation of early childhood staff. Prospects for success are enhanced by the growing awareness, evident even before the CDA project, of the limitations of teacher training and certification based solely on completion of a specified number of college hours or years. In addition, there is an emerging interest in competency-based training strategies.

LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS

The Office of Child Development mounted the CDA project with two principal long-term goals in mind:

1. To upgrade the quality of child development programs (Head Start, day care, etc.) through improving staff skills. In time, the CDA should have the effect of setting standards for staff qualified to have responsibility for young children; and

2. To increase the supply of trained child care staff to keep pace with the continued expansion of preschool programs.

Several long-term strategic issues arise in considering these goals. They include:

- Supply and demand for child development staff;
- Funding sources for CDA training;
- Support from state governments;
- Applicability of the CDA approach to other human resource areas; and
- Implications for the community colleges.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Some critics have charged that the CDA project is vulnerable to the same forces that have produced an oversupply of teachers in recent years. Perhaps so, and to be on safe ground, we are carrying out an in-depth analysis of supply and demand data. At present, however, the evidence points to a continued and growing need for child care staff despite a recent series of disappointing events affecting child development legislation and funding.

The "teacher surplus" in elementary and high school grades in recent years has been accompanied by a severe shortage of preschool personnel. In addition, over one-third of the staff of day care centers changes every year. Basic demographic and social trends, including increased participation rates of women in the labor force, have stimulated the dramatic growth in child care over the last decade and are still at work. The number of children, ages one through six, is expected to increase another three million by 1980, to about 28 million.

Approximately 45 percent of mothers with children now prefer to work, and the figures are higher among minority and low-income families. Parents are placing higher priority on providing their very young children with the advantages of a good preschool program.

Rather than an early childhood "CDA surplus", we will have to run hard just to stand still in terms of numbers alone. And we cannot afford to settle for numbers alone when the lives of our children are at stake!

FUNDING SOURCES

We do not expect to accomplish any miracles with 10-15 CDA pilot training sites. If the CDA concept is to work, it will take more than that. Part of the answer lies, we believe, in the large number of training institutions that have told us they plan to deliver CDA training anyway—whether or not they receive a pilot grant. They want the list of competencies and a chance to share ideas, but basically, they are prepared to move in this direction using their own resources. We are now considering ways to stimulate this healthy grassroots activity and offer appropriate assistance.

In addition, the Office of Child Development is redirecting its own resources. The Head Start Supplementary Training Program, funded at over \$3.5 million, provides degree-oriented career development training for thousands of Head Start staff annually. We plan to focus over 50% of such Head Start training on CDA competency-based training aimed at the CDA credential. We will be seeking the cooperation of supplementary training institutions in granting course credits and, where appropriate, degrees. While the credential itself will not be based on credits or degrees, we believe that they can contribute to future career development opportunities. It is expected that preschool "Master Teachers" of the future will be persons who have obtained the CDA credential but have gone on for additional training in child development.

In the final analysis, however, the Office of Child Development lacks the resources for funding CDA training on the scale required. The U.S. Office of Education, the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies are the primary sources of training funds. Home economics, vocational and adult education, and any community college programs, administered by the U.S. Office of Education, are possible sources of CDA training funds. Training for teachers of preschool handicapped children could be focused on the CDA competencies.

Congressional interest has focused on the need for additional legislation and funding for child development personnel training. Legislation that would have expanded such programs and provided specific funding authorization for CDA training was introduced this year but failed to pass.

STATE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

Over a period of time, states can be expected to play a key role in the CDA. State involvement in licensing and certification of preschool staff remains limited but is a growing trend. The Education Commission of the States had expressed strong interest in competency-based training for preschool staff.

Several states have approached the Office of Child Development offering to participate in various facets of the CDA project. Several key state groups are also involved in the CDA Consortium.

We will be working with selected states during the pilot phase of the CDA project. This experience should provide the basis for expanded state involvement.

CDA APPROACH IN OTHER HUMAN SERVICES AREAS

Secretary Richardson has been highly supportive of the CDA project and has personally tracked its progress as an HEW priority project under our Operational Planning System.

In response to the Secretary's stimulus, we will be assessing the applicability of CDA-type competency based career preparation, training and credentialing strategies to other human service professions. Among those areas, we expect to include health,

vocational rehabilitation, and related child development areas.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The response on the part of community colleges to the CDA pilot training suggests the high interest in this area. There are several characteristics of community colleges that make the CDA a natural focus:

Pioneering innovative forms of training; Outreach to other community institutions in providing field experiences;

Alternative learning strategies for adults, including persons with limited prior formal education; and

Flexible approaches to granting course credits and degrees.

I would encourage and expect community colleges to place greater emphasis in the future on training in early childhood education and on programs centered on the CDA competencies.

As the importance of education and development in the early years of the child's life gains greater recognition, we must pioneer new approaches to mounting sound programs to meet those needs. Competency-based training of child care staff is such an approach and it merits your careful consideration.

REMARKS ON BEHALF OF MARTIN LUTHER KING'S BIRTHDAY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a man whose struggle for justice for black people will long be remembered by all Americans. A self-described believer in nonviolence, Dr. King practiced what he called "a type of constructive, non-violent tension." He acted upon his belief that—

Injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.

These words are as applicable today as they were in 1963. Although buses and lunch counters are no longer segregated, and rest rooms are no longer marked "white" and "colored," the struggle of blacks for equality in America has not ended. All the problems of our minorities were not solved by the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In fact, whatever commitment was made by the Federal Government seems to have trickled away. Programs established to assist minorities, such as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, have faltered through underfunding. Manpower training programs have been given half-hearted support. And now the President has designated as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity a man who publicly disclaims support for the programs of the agency he would head.

The argument that the economic problems of blacks is diminishing simply does not hold water. In April 1972, black unemployment was 10.5 percent, while the national average was 5.9 percent. Unemployment among black youth a year ago was 44 percent, compared to the national average of 18.8 percent at

that time. Unemployment among black veterans is double that of white veterans.

It is not insignificant that Dr. King's purpose in being in Memphis the day he was assassinated was to force public attention on the inequity of pay scales for black and white sanitation workers. Dr. King realized that economic equality is as important as the right to sit anywhere on a bus or at a lunch counter. As Dr. King said—

We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a small ghetto to a larger one.

TO INSURE ADEQUATE TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT FOR NATIONAL GUARD

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have been joined by 18 of my colleagues in introducing legislation designed to insure that the National Guard is adequately trained and equipped to handle civil disturbances.

As we know, the National Guard has two missions. It is a State militia organized, trained, and equipped to protect life and property and preserve order and public safety within the State it serves. Second, it has a national mission to provide organized units of trained personnel with sufficient and suitable equipment to augment the Active Army and Air Force in time of war or national emergency.

Between September 1967 and the present, the National Guard has played almost no role in the war in Southeast Asia. During the same period, however, it assisted civil authorities in dealing with urban and campus disorder 221 times. Despite this clear evidence to the contrary, the National Guard Bureau and the Department of Defense have stubbornly clung to the anachronistic view that the Guard's primary mission is its combat support role.

The consequences of this have been tragic. The Guard's record during the 1967 riots was so poor that the Kerner Commission report said that—

The performance of Guard forces in certain disorders, particularly in Newark and Detroit, raised doubts regarding their capabilities for this type of mission (civil disturbances).

Stung by this accusation—and its truth—the Pentagon responded by formulating requirements for 33 hours of civil defense training for Guard units assigned civil disturbance duty—previously it had been strictly voluntary. Then, during the relative civil calm of 1968, the Pentagon reduced the annual requirement to 16 hours of refresher training, with 8 additional hours for new recruits. There was no issuance of riot control equipment and each State was left to formulate its own plans on how to proceed in civil disturbances, with no Federal requirements, even though the Congress pays 90 percent of the operating costs of the equipment and nearly half of the cost of the physical installations and facilities of the Guard.

In light of this inadequate, ostrichlike response, it is not surprising that the Guard failed in its next mission. At Kent State in May of 1970, the Guard responded to taunts with bullets that killed four students and wounded 10 others, several of whom were not even participating in the demonstration.

A month after Kent State, I introduced legislation along with 33 other Members of Congress to insure that the Guard would never again go into domestic battle so ill prepared to carry out such a delicate mission. That legislation, which I am reintroducing today, would recognize the importance of the Guard's role in civil disturbances.

It seeks to guarantee that the National Guard will be prepared to meet constantly changing domestic conditions by creating a Commission on the Capability of the National Guard to Control Civil Disturbances.

The Commission members would be the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and three persons from the private sector who would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The legislation would also create the States Advisory Council on Civil Disturbances which would be composed of the National Guard adjutant generals and the chief law enforcement officials in each State, with the major objective of attaining coordinated State-National Guard plans in each State to more effectively cope with civil disorders.

The basic task of the Commission would be to establish minimum training, doctrine, and equipment standards for the National Guard with respect to its use in civil disorders. The bill, however, does prescribe three specific standards: First, National Guardsmen would be required to devote at least 1 week of their 6-month active duty training solely to civil disturbance training; second, each commissioned and noncommissioned officer would be required to participate in an officer training school patterned after the highly effective civil disturbance orientation course of the Army; and, third, no command to load and lock weapons may be issued before a National Guard unit is deployed at a disturbance unless there is immediate peril of life.

In addition, the Commission would be required to perform annual inspection of all National Guard units to make sure that the standards are being implemented and adhered to; to perform comprehensive reviews and critiques of the operations of Guard units when used in civil disturbance control duty; and to report at least annually to Congress its findings on the capability of the Guard to perform its civil disturbance functions.

Any National Guard unit which was not found in conformity with the standards prescribed by the Commission would not be entitled to Federal funds.

While the Pentagon's response to the Kent State tragedy has been encouraging—requiring 16 hours of civil disturbance training during basic training and supplying the relevant National Guard units with riot batons, helmets, and armored vests—it is either sufficient nor,

based on past experience, likely to last. It seems evident that as long as the National Guard Bureau and the Pentagon view the Guard's primary mission as support of the Active Army, the Guard's role in civil disturbances will remain a stepchild, to be indulged only so long as there is a clear and present danger of civil disturbances. Any lull in domestic disturbances, such as we are experiencing now, is likely to result in the downgrading of the Guard's preparation and ability to handle civil disorders.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would remedy this shortsighted, ad hoc approach by recognizing the real importance of the Guard's role in civil disturbances, for only then will we have fulfilled our constitutional responsibility to "guarantee every State in this union a republican form of government and protect each of them against domestic violence."

I urge the House Armed Services Committee to hold hearings as soon as possible on this matter of utmost national importance.

U.S. SUGAR PRICES UNAFFECTED BY SOVIET FOOD SHORTAGES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet crop failures have affected all areas of world agriculture. Sugar is the latest food shortage facing Russians and forcing the Soviet Union to buy from the world market, thus directly affecting all market prices.

The effect of the Russian sugar purchases have not been reflected in the prices facing the U.S. consumer, because of the insulating effect of the Sugar Act, an act of Congress under which foreign sugar producers are given a quota, at a premium price, for future years. The effect of the Sugar Act—which is evident from the fact that American sugar prices have not been forced up by the Soviet purchases on the world market—is to stabilize the price of sugar in the United States.

At the end of 1972, U.S. consumers enjoyed sugar prices over 1 cent per pound cheaper than that on the world market. This means that foreign sugar producers, in making good their quotas under the U.S. Sugar Act, are presently selling sugar to the United States at a loss compared to the price they could get on the world market.

The Department of Agriculture admits that sugar supplies are now as scarce as at any time since World War II. Estimates for the current 1972-73 crop year are that consumption will again exceed production by about 1 to 1.75 million tons. If current estimates of production and consumption are achieved, carryover stocks at the end of August 1973 may be less than a 60-day supply. What happens during 1973 may well depend on the present crop being harvested in Cuba and the spring crop to be planted in Rus-

sia. The desperate condition of the food producing segment of Cuba was best illustrated by Castro's refusing to allow time off for his people to celebrate Christmas, because the celebration might have interfered with the harvesting of the sugar crop. And the Russians need sugar to replace their own shortages, be they from natural causes or failures resulting from their own economic system.

The Sugar Act, which terminates next year, has long had many foes. It remains to be seen in 1973 whether, as claimed by some, the United States is subsidizing foreign sugar interests or acting in the best interests of the American consumers by stabilizing sugar prices at the cheapest "sweet" bargain in the world unaffected by the failures of the Cubans and the shortages of the Soviets.

I insert in the RECORD a related news clipping and correspondence from the Department of Agriculture:

[From the Foreign Agriculture, Sept. 25, 1972]

U.S.S.R. SUGARBEET CROP AFFECTED BY HOT WEATHER

Unusual, extreme heat this summer has caused serious difficulties for some sugarbeet growers. According to a Soviet news article, several sugarbeet areas in the country will not be able to fulfill their quotas for marketing sugarbeets for factory use.

Prospects in the Ukraine, the major sugarbeet growing region, however, reportedly were hopeful, even though some eastern areas of the Republic were not expected to meet production plans. Sugarbeets in the more important western part of the Ukraine were said to be in good condition. Despite some losses, Ukrainian specialists had affirmed that the Republic's output this year would be no less than last year's 46 million tons, according to the article.

In 1971, total USSR sugarbeet output fell 8 percent below the 1970 level because of adverse growing and harvesting conditions. At this time, it appears that the 1972 output may not be much larger than the disappointing level of 1971.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1973.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR Mr. RARICK: This is in response to your telephone request on January 4 for information concerning the world sugar situation.

The United States sugar market is substantially, but not completely, insulated from the world situation at times when total world sugar supplies are scarce. When total world supplies are in balance with or in excess of world consumption, insulation of the U.S. market is virtually complete.

World sugar supplies are now as scarce as they have been at any time since World War II. On only one other occasion were supplies as tight—during 1963 and 1964—and recent developments suggest that the present situation may be worse. World consumption exceeded world production by almost 2.0 million metric tons during the crop year which began in September 1970 (crop year 70/71). During crop year 71/72 production fell short of consumption by about 3.3 million metric tons, and our best estimate for the current (72/73) crop year is that consumption will again exceed production by about 1.0 to 1.75 million tons.

Despite the fact that world sugar supplies are very tight, there is no danger of a shortage of sugar in the United States. Sugar quotas in the preferential U.S. market are eagerly sought and carefully guarded. U.S. market prices customarily bring a premium over the world market and those foreign

suppliers who fail to fill their quota are penalized in their quotas for subsequent years. Consequently few risk such cuts for short-term profit in the world market.

The gap between world production and consumption has resulted in reduced carry-over stocks. Whenever initial stocks stand at about 25 percent of expected annual consumption, supply and demand are in a comfortable balance. Larger quantities are a burden on the market, and smaller quantities create a tight supply situation. If current estimates of 72/73 crop production (76.0 million tons) and consumption (77.8 million tons) are achieved, carryover stocks at the end of August 1973 will stand at only about 13.9 million tons, or less than a 60-day supply.

Prices in the world market for raw sugar strengthened sharply during the past year in response to the tight supply situation. During the first three months of 1972 the world price exceeded the U.S. price by about one-half cent per pound, and the same situation prevailed again during December 1973 when the world price was higher by just over one cent per pound. But for the year as a whole, the U.S. price was higher than the world market price by 0.56 cent per pound.

What happens during 1973 depends to a large extent on the size of the sugar crop now being harvested in Cuba, and the crop to be planted this spring in the U.S.S.R. Both have publicly announced increases in production goals, but a great deal of official secrecy surrounds operations in both countries. Nevertheless, we expect world sugar prices to remain high throughout calendar year 1973—near, or perhaps a little higher than the U.S. price on average.

We hope this answers your questions about the current world sugar situation.

Sincerely,

LEO L. SOMMERVILLE,
Acting Director, Sugar Division.

FBI REPORT ON KENT STATE SHOOTINGS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1970, the Nation and the world were shocked by the killing of four students and the wounding of nine others by shots fired by Ohio National Guardsmen during a demonstration at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio against the Nixon administration's invasion of Cambodia.

For me, as a resident of the area, and for millions of other Americans, the Kent State tragedy will always be remembered as one of the saddest days in our Nation's history. How terrible that the divisions created by the Vietnam war had brought us to the point where young Americans in their Nation's uniform were shooting other young Americans. For some of us it raised the awful specter of civil war. We can thank God and the innate decency of millions of Americans that the specter did not become reality.

Despite the investigations following the tragedy, the complete truth about what happened at Kent State has never clearly emerged. The FBI made an extensive investigation of the tragedy, but their reports have never been released to the public. However, a copy of the Justice Department's summary of the

FBI reports is a matter of public record in the files of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

As a result of redistricting, Kent State University and the city of Kent are now in the congressional district that I represent. In view of the continuing widespread interest and concern, both nationally and locally, in the events that culminated in the Kent State shootings of May 4, 1970, I offer the complete text of the Justice Department's summary of FBI reports on Kent State and include it in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S SUMMARY OF FBI REPORTS

(NOTE.—This report is a summary, prepared sometime in July 1970 by the Justice Department's Civil Rights division, of the FBI reports on Kent State. The purpose of such summaries is to provide guidelines for possible prosecution under federal law. The summary was also made available to the Ohio authorities. Excerpts from this report appeared in The New York Times in November 1970 but this is the first publication of the full text.)

Kent State University is located in the small university town of Kent in the northeastern portion of Ohio, approximately ten miles northeast of Akron and thirty miles southeast of Cleveland. Approximately 20,000 students are enrolled at this institution; 85% of whom are graduates of Ohio high schools.

The only previous major turbulence at Kent State occurred in November, 1968 and April, 1969. In November, 1968, black and white students staged a sit-in to protest the efforts of the Oakland, California Police Department to enlist new recruits from the student body of Kent State. To our knowledge, no personal or property damage occurred at this time.

In April, 1969, the Kent State Chapter of SDS disrupted a meeting being held in the Music and Speech Building. Fifty-eight students were arrested—among them were four leaders of SDS. Subsequently, SDS was banned from the Kent State Campus. During the 1968-69 school year, national leaders of SDS, including Mark Rudd and Bernardine Dohrn, had visited the Campus, presumably because SDS was then a recognized campus activity. On Wednesday, April 29, 1970, the four SDS leaders imprisoned for their part in the April 29, 1969 melee were released from jail. Although there has been speculation in local law enforcement circles that they participated or even planned the confrontations occurring May 1-4, 1970, there is no evidence to substantiate this. Similarly, although Jerry Rubin made a speech at Kent State on April 10, 1970, no connection has been made between that speech and the May 1-4 weekend. To our knowledge, from April, 1969 until May 1, 1970, Kent State University experienced no problems with student unrest.

On April 30, 1970, President Richard Nixon made a televised address to the nation and at that time announced that he was committing United States troops from Viet Nam into specified areas of Cambodia. The reaction of some Kent State students and faculty members was immediate.

On Friday, May 1, at 12:00 noon a rally, sponsored by a group of Kent State University history graduate students, self styled *The World Historians Opposed to Racism and Exploitation (WHORE)*, was held on the commons at the Victory Bell in response to the President's announcement of the previous evening. This rally drew approximately 500 faculty and students. The general theme of the speeches was that the President had disregarded the limits of his office imposed by the Constitution of the United States and

that, as a consequence, the Constitution had become a lifeless document, murdered by the President. As a symbolic act, a copy of the Constitution was buried at the base of the Victory Bell. Anti-war sentiment was articulated by the speakers. One student, supposedly a Viet Nam veteran, burned what was purported to be his military discharge papers. The rally disbanded without exhortation to more violent means of protest and with an expressed desire that another rally be held at 12:00 noon on Monday, May 4, 1970, to further protest the war in Viet Nam and the invasion of Cambodia.

At 3:00 p.m. on the same day, May 1, a rally was held by the Black United Students (BUS), a small organization composed of some of the Negro students on the Kent State Campus. Speakers at this rally were Negro students from Ohio State University. In general, these speakers concerned themselves with issues primarily concerning the black community, and not with the issue of the war. This meeting was sparsely attended and also broke up peacefully.

No further rallies or assemblies occurred on the Kent State Campus on Friday.

On Friday night, May 1, 1970, the scene shifted to North Water Street, just off Main Street in the heart of downtown Kent—an area lined with bars and taverns frequented by students, but also by non-students. We are not sure how the incident on this night started. At about 11:00 p.m., a small crowd gathered on the street between two bars, one known as "J.B." and the other known as "The Kove." Anti-war slogans were chanted. A police car cruised through the area and was greeted with applause. As it left the area, the applause grew. The police car continued on a number of other occasions to pass by the students. On the fourth or fifth pass, at about 11:27 p.m. some people threw beer bottles and glasses at the car, which kept going and did not return. The street was then blocked off by the people and a bonfire was built in the street. It seems certain that not all of the persons in the street were students. There were members of a motorcycle gang present at some time during the night's activities but statements conflict on the question of whether they participated in the incident.

At 11:41 p.m., all twenty-one Kent Police-men were summoned to duty. The Stow Police Department was alerted as well as was the Portage County Sheriff's Department, which sent 80-90 regular and special deputies to Kent. Apparently after the law enforcement officers arrived on the scene, the crowd in the street, now numbering probably between 400 and 500, began to break windows in various business establishments in the area. One jewelry store was looted. At 12:30 a.m., May 2, 1970, Mayor Satrom proclaimed the City of Kent to be in a State of Civil Emergency. A 8:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. curfew was established in the town and all establishments selling alcoholic beverages were closed and the sale of alcohol, firearms, ammunition and gasoline was prohibited. At 1:42 a.m. police used teargas to move the students from the downtown area toward the Campus. At 2:27 a.m., the students were reported as being on the Campus. At 3:00 a.m., two Ohio Highway Patrolmen had arrived in Kent to view the incident, but at this time, the disturbance was over.

The damage to the business in the City of Kent was first estimated at approximately \$50,000 by the Mayor. We do not know exactly how many windows were broken nor how many establishments were damaged. The Mayor subsequently revised his earlier estimate of \$50,000 in property damage to \$15,000. Newspapers have reported that ten to fifteen buildings had windows broken. No fire, except for the street fire, was related to the disturbance. Four or five policemen or sheriff's deputies were injured by rocks thrown by students, but none required hos-

pitalization. Fifteen persons were arrested, all of whom gave Ohio addresses.

On Saturday morning, May 2, a meeting was held among University officials, city officials and a representative of the National Guard. Although University officials regarded the action as unnecessary, in that they felt that local law enforcement personnel could cope with any situation that might arise, the Mayor, other city officials and the National Guard representative decided at that time to put a company of 110 National Guardsmen on standby. Two other such meetings were held during the day. We do not know what was discussed or decided at the subsequent meetings. Apparently, at 10:00 a.m. the Sheriff of Portage County orally requested the assistance of National Guard troops. We do not know whether the Sheriff's action was taken independently of the decision made at the Saturday morning meetings.

Mayor Satrom at 5:00 p.m., Saturday, May 2, 1970, telephoned "Columbus" (presumably Governor Rhodes), and advised that the local law enforcement agencies (apparently excluding the Highway Patrol) could not cope with the situation and requested National Guard troops to "assist in restoring law and order in the City of Kent . . . and Kent State University. . . ." This request was also made in writing to the Commander of Troops, Ohio National Guard. Governor Rhodes orally authorized the use of the National Guard in the City of Kent. No University official was consulted prior to Mayor Satrom's request. Companies A and C, 145th Infantry and Troop G, 107th Armored Cavalry, Ohio National Guard, mobilized on April 29, 1970, in connection with the Teamster strike and on active duty status since that date, were alerted and prepared to move to Kent. Upon receiving this order to move, Company A was immediately given a one or two hour lesson in riot control. Troops began arriving in Kent at 7:00 p.m.

Additionally, on May 2, an injunction affecting the University was entered in the Court of Common Pleas in the case of *State of Ohio, ex rel Board of Trustees of Kent State University v. Michael Weekly and "John Doe," Numbers 1-500*.² The order enjoined the defendants from breaking windows, defacing buildings with paint, starting any fires on campus and damaging or destroying any property owned by the University. It is not known who sought the injunction nor at what time it was entered, nor if the injunction was served upon any person or disseminated in any way.

Although things were quiet on the Kent State University Campus, during the day on May 2, word had passed among the students that a rally on the commons was planned that night for 8:00 p.m. At 7:30 p.m., the Ohio State Highway Patrol was notified that approximately 600 had gathered on the commons. At 8:00 p.m., the sheriff's department sent 60 men to Kent. The crowd left the commons and made the rounds of a number of dormitories in an effort to enlist additional members in their group. After their efforts to recruit more students, the crowd moved back to the commons.

The wooden ROTC building, a target for some students because of its symbolism of U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, was located on the western portion of the commons. It became the focal point of the demonstration. Rocks were thrown by some persons at the ROTC building, beginning at 8:10 p.m. Subsequently, rocks and a wastebasket were thrown through windows. Flares were thrown in the windows and on top of the building with no fire resulting. One person attempted to set the curtains in the ROTC building on fire. This attempt was unsuccessful. An American flag was burned. One photographer was assaulted, his camera taken and the film exposed. Finally one per-

son dipped a rag in gasoline obtained from a motorcycle parked nearby and threw the burning rag in the ROTC building. At 8:30 p.m., the building was on fire, however, the Kent Fire Department's records indicate that it was not notified until 8:49 p.m. The fire department sent trucks to the scene. Upon arrival, the firemen were harassed and had their fire hoses taken forcibly from them and cut. At approximately 9:00 p.m.,³ the Kent University Police Department which had two 12 man squads in the area but had to this time taken no action, moved to the scene of the ROTC building in an attempt to protect the firemen⁴ and disperse the crowd. As they arrived, the firemen left the ROTC building which was not yet ablaze. The Kent University policemen were joined at 9:17 by ten men from the Portage County Sheriff's Office. (At 8:40, twenty state policemen had been sent to the Campus, but not the commons area. Apparently they were in the vicinity of the President's home.) Together they fired teargas at the crowd and at about 9:30 p.m., drove it in a northeasterly direction across the commons where a small athletic shed was set on fire. Four Kent State University policemen were injured by rocks, but none was hurt seriously. Much of the crowd continued toward the downtown area of Kent, but others attempted to put out the fire started in the athletic shed.

In the absence of the firemen, at about 9:45 p.m., the ROTC building flared up and began to burn furiously. The fire department returned to the Campus between 10:00 p.m. and 10:20 p.m., but the building was consumed. By 10:30 p.m. at least 400 members of Company A and Company C, 145th Infantry and Troop G, 107th Armored Cavalry, Ohio National Guard had arrived in Kent. Company A and Troop G were sent to the vicinity of the ROTC building. Troop G's convoy was stoned as it approached the Campus. Eight Guardsmen were injured by rocks and flying glass—at least one of whom required medical attention. Some members of the crowd, about 200, who were prevented by law enforcement agencies from going to the downtown area of Kent, returned to the ROTC building. At about 10:30 p.m., they were dispersed by teargas fired by members of the National Guard and Sheriff's Department. By 11:00 p.m., all members of the crowd had fully dispersed and the Campus was quiet. At some time between 9:30 and 11:30 p.m. about 100 Ohio state police had swept the Campus and found no demonstrators. By 3:00 a.m., May 3, 1970, 60-70 Ohio State policemen, all members of the Sheriff's Office, and all members of Troop G had been released from duty. Some members of Company A and 20 members of the Ohio State Highway Patrol established roving patrols and posted men at various points on the perimeter of the Campus. They remained on duty until 6:00 a.m., Sunday, May 3, 1970.

Thus far, there have been identified 13 persons involved in the burning of the ROTC building and the harassment of firemen; some of the identified persons are high school students from Ohio who were possibly on LSD at the time of the burning. One person is alleged to be the principal narcotics peddler in Kent. None of the victims of the shooting incident have been implicated in the unlawful burning of the ROTC building.⁴ In addition, none has been identified as an out of state, non-student as having any part in the unlawful burning [sic].

At 10:30 a.m., Sunday morning, May 3, 1970, Governor Rhodes, Portage County Prosecutor Ronald Kane, representatives from the Highway Patrol and National Guard, City officials, University officials and others held a conference in Kent. A decision was reached to keep the University open for classes. Governor Rhodes advised Dr. White, President of Kent State, of this fact at approximately 12:00 noon, May 3, 1970. We are informed that subsequent to this meeting, Governor Rhodes held a press conference at which time he

accused three or four agitators of plotting the disruptions and of attempting to close the University down. He was apparently referring to the "Kent Four" just released from jail. Rhodes pledged to use every force of law to restore the situation.

From 6:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m., both Troop G, 107th Armored Cavalry and Company C, 145th Infantry patrolled the Campus and the City of Kent. So far as we are aware, no incidents occurred during this time period. Company A, 145th Infantry was not on duty from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

At sometime during May 3rd, 1970, Robert Matson, Vice-President for Student Affairs and Frank Frisina, President of the Student Body issued a "special message to the University community." This "special message" informed the students and faculty that the Governor, through the National Guard, had assumed control of the Campus. They further reported that (a) all forms of rallies and outdoor demonstrations—whether peaceful or otherwise—were prohibited and that (b) although the curfew in the City was in effect from 8:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., the curfew in effect on the Campus was from 1:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. It is not known what person(s) decided that assemblies of all kinds would be prohibited nor do we know under what authority this decision was made, nor what distribution the "special message" received. There are indications that it was posted on University buildings. Some members of Company C and of Troop G were recalled to duty to supplement Company A which had come on duty at 6:00 p.m. Approximately 50 sheriff's deputies were sent to Kent at 8:30 p.m.

At about 8:30 p.m., Sunday, a group of persons began gathering on the commons. Some were going from dorm to dorm to gather more people.

At about 9:15 p.m., Kent State University Police Officers read to the gathered persons, approximately 1000-1500, the Riot Provisions of Ohio law and ordered them to disperse. The crowd then moved to the home of President White where they were dispersed by teargas by state police. From this location the group apparently splintered. Some attempted to go downtown and got to the corner of Lincoln and Main Streets, adjacent to the Campus, where they were halted by law enforcement officers. This was at approximately 11:00 p.m. It is possible that some students had been sitting down at this location from as early as 9:00 p.m. Law enforcement officers from the city and county faced the students while National Guardsmen took a position behind them. State police helicopters were overhead with searchlights being played on the crowd. Subsequently, one student obtained a bullhorn from the law enforcement officers and read to the students a list of demands; each such demand was greeted with applause. The demands read were that:

1. The ROTC program be removed from the campus;
2. Full amnesty be granted for all persons arrested Saturday night;
3. All demands, whatever they might be, of BUS (Black United Students), be met;
4. The National Guard be removed from the campus by Monday night;
5. The curfew be lifted;
6. Tuition for all students be decreased.

Subsequently, a student (possibly the same one) spoke with police officers and thereafter announced by bullhorn to the students that the National Guard would be immediately leaving the front Campus and that, in response to their demands that they speak with Mayor Satrom, President White and/or Governor Rhodes, Mayor Satrom was on his way to the gathering of students and that they were still looking for President White. It seems that many students then moved onto the Campus, thinking that an agreement had been reached. Shortly thereafter, a

Footnotes at end of article.

law enforcement officer or National Guardsman, probably the latter, announced over a loudspeaker that the curfew had been moved two hours, from 1:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., and that the students were to disperse immediately. This announcement was greeted with anger, obscenities and rocks, at which time the National Guard fired teargas into the crowd and advanced upon them with bayonets. About 200 students attempted to escape into the library located at the intersection of Lincoln and Main. Two students were probably bayoneted at this time. Most of the other students retreated slowly toward their dormitories; others, however, remained to be arrested. The students who went into the library were later removed by the Highway Patrol peacefully and without arrests.

At least one group of about 300 students was pursued with teargas by the National Guard through the Campus to the area of the Tri-Tower dormitories, where they were hesitantly allowed entrance to escape the teargas. Allison Krause was among these persons.

By 1:00 a.m., Monday, May 4, 1970, the Campus was quiet. Fifty-one persons were arrested for curfew violations. The members of Troop G and Company C who were recalled to duty about 8:30 p.m. were released. Company A continued its regular duty.

At 6:00 a.m., May 4, 1970, the Ohio State Highway Patrol had 20 men on the Campus. Company A was relieved of duty by Company C and Troop G, both of which had moved—at least in part—early that morning from their bivouac areas off campus to the football stadium on the Campus. Company A was to move from the gymnasium to the football stadium immediately after they came off duty at 6:00 a.m. It is believed that this move was partially accomplished by Company A. Morning gym classes were cancelled because of the presence of National Guard troops in the gym and at the time of the shooting some unknown number of National Guardsmen were located in the gymnasium. As of Monday morning, May 4, 1970, approximately 850 National Guardsmen were located on the Kent State Campus.

At 10:00 a.m. a meeting was held among representatives of Kent State University, Ohio National Guard, the Ohio State Highway Patrol and city officials. At this time, a uniform curfew of 8:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., applicable both to the city and the Campus, was agreed upon and the Mayor's Proclamation of Civil Emergency, dated May 2, 1970 was modified to reflect this change. Also at this meeting, an unknown representative of Kent State University requested that the rally rumored to be held at 12:00 noon not be allowed to be held.⁵ However, subsequent information suggests that it was the O.H.N.G. who determined that the rally would not be held.

During the weekend, word had been orally passed that there was to be a rally on the commons at 12:00 noon, Monday, May 4, 1970, in protest of any or all of the following:

1. The invasion of Cambodia by the U.S.
2. The presence of the National Guard on Campus
3. The ROTC program on campus
4. Research at the Liquid Crystals Institute (which, rumor had it had to do with developing body heat detectors for use in jungle warfare).⁶

By 10:30 a.m., a few students had gathered on the commons and by 11:30 a.m., students began ringing the Victory Bell to attract other students to the commons area.

At about 11:30 a.m. some members of Company C and Troop G, on patrol since 6:00 a.m., were told to move to the ROTC building. Company A, relieved from duty at 6:00 a.m. had the opportunity to receive about three hours sleep when some of its members also were told to move to the ROTC

building. The troops were moved into position around the ROTC building facing the students about 175 yards away at about 11:45 a.m. Ninety-nine men from the National Guard were present; 53 from Company A, 25 from Company C and 18 from Troop G, all led by General Canterbury, Lt. Col. Fassinger and Major Jones. Apparently no plan for dispersing the students was formulated.

Most persons estimate that about 200-300 students were gathered around the Victory Bell on the commons with another 1,000 or so students gathered on the hill directly behind them.⁷ Apparently, the crowd was without a definite leader, although at least three persons carried flags. An unidentified person made a short speech urging that the university be struck. We are not aware of any other speeches being made. The crowd apparently was initially peaceful and relatively quiet.

At approximately 11:50 a.m., the National Guard requested a bullhorn from the Kent State University Police Department. An announcement was made that the students disperse but apparently it was faint and not heard since it evoked no response from the students.⁸ Consequently, three National Guardsmen and a Kent State University Policeman got in a jeep and, again using the bullhorn to order the students to disperse, drove past the crowd. This announcement was greeted with cries of "— you" and many students made obscene gestures. Victim Jeff Miller was one of this group. The jeep drove past the students, a second time. At this time, the students in unison sang/ chanted "Power to the people. — the pigs." The announcement to disperse was made a 3rd time at which time the students chanted "One, two, three, four, we don't want your — ing war," and after which they continuously chanted "Strike, strike . . ." The jeep then apparently came closer to the crowd saying clearly, "Attention. This is an order. Disperse immediately. This is an order. Leave this area immediately. This is an order. Disperse." This was greeted with cries of "— you." The above announcements were again repeated at which time the students responded "Pigs off campus." The Kent State University Policemen then announced, "For your own safety, all you bystanders and innocent people, leave." The crowd replied with chants of "Sieg Heil."

At some point when the jeep drove by the crowd of students, a few rocks were thrown at it—one hitting the jeep and a second striking a Guardsman but doing no damage. Major Jones of the National Guard, after one last above announcement had been made and probably in response to the rock throwing, ran out to the jeep and ordered it to return to the line.

About five grenadiers were ordered to fire teargas from M-79 grenade launchers toward the crowd. The projectiles apparently fell short and caused the students to retreat only slightly up Blanket Hill in the direction of Taylor Hall. Some students ran to Verder Hall, ripped up sheets and moistened them for use as gas masks. Some students, a few with gas masks, and others with wet rags over their faces retrieved the teargas canisters and threw them back in the direction of the National Guard. This action brought loud cheers from the students as they moved back to their original positions near the Victory Bell. They also chanted "Pigs off campus." Again an announcement was made over a loudspeaker ordering the students to disperse. The students responded by chanting "Sieg Heil" and "One, two, three, four, we don't want your — ing war." They also sung/ chanted "Power to the people. — the pigs."

Between 12:05 p.m. and 12:15 p.m., the 96 men of Companies A and C, 145th Infantry and of Troop G, 107th Armored Cavalry were ordered to advance. Bayonets were fixed and their weapons were "locked and loaded," with one round in the chamber, pursuant to rules

laid down by the Ohio National Guard. All wore gas masks. Some carried .45 pistols, most carried M-1 rifles, and a few carried shotguns loaded with 7½ birdshot and double ought buckshot. One major also carried a .22 Beretta Pistol.

Prior to the advance of the National Guard, 30 Ohio State Highway Patrolmen were positioned behind them to make any necessary arrests. They did not advance with the Guard. Also prior to the advance, Company C was instructed that if any firing was to be done, it would be done by one man firing in the air (presumably on the order of the officer in charge). It is not known if any instructions concerning the firing of weapons was given to either Company A or Troop G [sic].

As the National Guard moved out from the ROTC building, Company A was on the right flank, Company C was on the left flank and Troop G was between the two. General Canterbury moved with the troops. As they approached the students, teargas was fired at the crowd. The combination of the advancing troops and the teargas forced the students to retreat. Some students retreated up Blanket Hill to the northeast of the advancing troops. The majority of students were forced up Blanket Hill to the south of Taylor Hall. Some rocks were thrown by the students at the National Guard at this time but were for the most part ineffective.⁹

As the Guard approached the bottom of Blanket Hill at the southwest corner of Taylor Hall, it split into two groups, each following the two main groups of students. Twenty-three members of Company C, under the command of Major Jones, moved around the northwest side of Taylor Hall and attempted to disperse the small crowd of students who had moved in this direction. They encountered little hostility although some rocks were thrown at them and some of their teargas canisters were returned. They reached a position on Blanket Hill slightly to the north and west of Taylor Hall and remained there throughout the incident. None of these 23 Guardsmen fired their weapons.

Fifty-three members of Company A, 18 members of Troop G and two members of Company C, all commanded by General Canterbury and Lt. Col. Fassinger moved to the south and east of Taylor Hall, pursuing the main body of students who retreated between Taylor and Johnson Halls. The great mass of students, upon reaching the southeast corner of Taylor Hall, merely opened their ranks and allowed the National Guard to pass between them; others, for safety or because they had been teargassed took refuge in various buildings; a large number of students retreated down the hill in front of Taylor Hall. The main body of National Guardsmen continued past Taylor Hall driving this last group of students in two directions. One group of students retreated to a paved parking lot south of Prentice Hall and from there into a gravel or rock parking lot south of Dunbar Hall. The other group retreated to the area of a football practice field southeast and approximately 150 yards from Taylor Hall. The National Guardsmen apparently momentarily halted to allow the students on the practice field time to pass through the two gates in the fence surrounding the field. The Guard then moved down the steep incline from Taylor Hall and onto the field where it took up a position in the northeastern portion of the field close to the fence. This second group of Guardsmen was hit with some rocks on its way to the fence from its initial starting point; seven Guardsmen claim they were hit with rocks at this time. They were also cursed constantly.

Some of the students who had retreated beyond the fence obtained rocks and possibly other objects from the parking area south of Dunbar Hall and from a construction site about 75 yards southeast of the practice football field. They then returned to within range of the Guard and began to pelt them

Footnotes at end of article.

with objects. The number of rock throwers at this time is not known and the estimates range between 10 and 50. Victim Dean Kahler and Barry Levine, boyfriend of Victim Allison Krause, threw rocks at the Guard. Debris, similar in composition to rocks found on the Kent State Campus, was found in the pockets of the jacket that Allison Krause was wearing. The rock throwers received encouragement from many of the other students who had retreated, but who did not take part in the rock throwing. Victims Canfora, Stamps and Grace were probably among this group waving flags and shouting encouragement. We believe that the rock throwing reached its peak at this time. Four Guardsmen claim they were hit with rocks at this time. Fourteen others claim they were hit with rocks but do not state when they were hit. We believe that it is probable that most were hit while they were positioned on the football practice field.

Because of the number of rocks thrown, every other Guardsman was ordered to face in an opposite direction to watch for missiles. Some rocks were thrown back at the students by the Guard. The majority of students who had merely stood aside and allowed the Guard to pass through their ranks massed on the hill in front of Taylor Hall to observe the Guardsmen and other students. Thus, the Guard appeared to be flanked on three sides by students while the Guard was on the practice field.

The Guard shot teargas at the students in the parking lot and at those to the south of them during the approximately 10 minutes on the practice field. It was, as far as we can tell, ineffective. A small amount of teargas was also fired without result at the mass of onlookers gathered in front of Taylor Hall. On one such occasion, the cannister was thrown back by a student, picked up by a National Guardsman, and thrown again at the students, and again was thrown back at the Guard. This "tennis match" was accompanied by loud cheering and laughing from the students.

Just prior to the time the Guard left its position on the practice field, members of Troop G were ordered to kneel and aim their weapons at the students in the parking lot south of Prentice Hall. They did so, but did not fire. One person, however, probably an Officer, at this point did fire a pistol in the air. No Guardsman admits firing this shot. Major Jones admitted drawing his .22 at about this time, but stated that he did not fire it. Although Major Jones had been with Company C at the top of Taylor Hall hill, he walked through the crowd to find out if General Canterbury wanted assistance.

The Guard was then ordered to regroup and move back up the hill past Taylor Hall. Interviews indicate that they moved into a formation whereby every other person faced Taylor Hall while the others faced the area of the practice field. Photographs, however, show most Guardsmen facing Taylor Hall. The students at this time apparently took up the chant, "One, two, three, four, we don't want your * * * war." Many students believed that the Guard had run out of teargas and they began to follow the Guard up the hill.

Some Guardsmen, including General Canterbury and Major Jones, claim that the Guard did run out of teargas at this time. However, in fact, it had not. Both Captain Srp and Lieutenant Stevenson of Troop G were aware that a limited supply of teargas remained and Srp had ordered one cannister loaded for use at the crest of Blanket Hill. In addition, Sp/4 Russell Repp of Company A told a newsman that he alone had eight cannisters of teargas remaining. This has not been confirmed. Repp did not mention teargas when he was interviewed by the FBI.

Some rocks were thrown as they moved up the hill and seven Guardsmen claim

that they were struck at this time. The crowd on top of the hill parted as the Guard advanced and allowed it to pass through, apparently without resistance. When the Guard reached the crest of Blanket Hill by the southeast corner of Taylor Hall at about 12:25 p.m., they faced the students following them and fired their weapons. Four students were killed and nine were wounded.

The few moments immediately prior to the firing by the National Guard are shrouded in confusion and highly conflicting statements. Many Guardsmen claim that they felt their lives were in danger from the students for a variety of reasons—some because they were "surrounded," some because a sniper fired at them, some because the following crowd was practically on top of them; some because the "sky was black with stones," some because the students "charged" them or "advanced upon them in a threatening manner," some because of a combination of the above. Some claim their lives were in danger, but do not state any reason why this was so.

Approximately 45 Guardsmen did not fire their weapons or take any other action to defend themselves.¹⁰ Most of the National Guardsmen who did fire their weapons do not specifically claim that they fired because their lives were in danger. Rather, they generally simply state in their narrative that they fired after they heard others fire or because after the shooting began, they assumed an order to fire in the air had been given. As a general rule, most Guardsmen add the claim that their lives were or were not in danger to the end of their statements almost as an afterthought.

Six Guardsmen, including two sergeants and Captain Srp of Troop G stated pointedly that the lives of the members of the Guard were not in danger and that it was not a shooting situation. The FBI interviews of the Guardsmen are in many instances quite remarkable for what is not said, rather than what is said. Many Guardsmen do not mention the students or that the crowd or any part of it was "advancing" or "charging." Many do not mention where the crowd was or what it was doing.

We have some reason to believe that the claim by the National Guard that their lives were endangered by the students was fabricated subsequent to the event. The apparent volunteering by some Guardsmen of the fact that their lives were not in danger gives rise to some suspicions. One usually does not mention what did not occur. Additionally, an unknown Guardsman, age 23, married, and a machinist by trade was interviewed by members of the Knight newspaper chain. He admitted that his life was not in danger and that he fired indiscriminately into the crowd. He further stated that the Guardsmen had gotten together after the shooting and decided to fabricate the story that they were in danger of serious bodily harm or death from the students. The published newspaper article quoted the Guardsman as saying:

"The guys have been saying that we got to get together and stick to the same story, that it was our lives or them, a matter of survival. I told them I would tell the truth and couldn't get in trouble that way."

Also, a chaplain of Troop G spoke with many members of the National Guard and stated that they were unable to explain to him why they fired their weapons. We do not know the specific individuals with whom the chaplain spoke.

As with the Guardsmen, the students tell a conflicting story of what happened just prior to the shootings. A few students claim that a mass of students who had been following the Guard on its retreat to Taylor Hall from the

practice football field suddenly "charged" the Guardsmen hurling rocks. These students allege in general that the Guard was justified in firing because otherwise they might have been overrun by the onrushing mob.

A few other students claim that the students were gathered in the parking lot south of Prentice Hall—a distance of 80 yards or better from the Guard—when some of the Guardsmen suddenly turned and fired their weapons at the gathered crowd. They generally either do not mention rock throwing or say that it was light and ineffective.

A plurality of students give the general impression that the majority of students following the Guard were located in and around the parking lot south of Prentice Hall. They also state that a small group of students—perhaps 20 or 25—ran in the direction of the Guard and threw rocks at them from a moderate to short distance. The distance varies from as close as 10 feet to 50 feet or more. However, as will be discussed later in detail, available photographs indicate that the nearest student was 60 feet away. At this time, they allege that the Guard began firing at the students.

There are certain facts that we can presently establish to a reasonable certainty. It is undisputed that the students who had been pursued by Troop G and Company A in turn followed the Guardsmen as they moved from the practice football field to Taylor Hall. Some rocks were thrown and curses were shouted. No verbal warning was given to the students immediately prior to the time the Guardsmen fired. We do not know whether the bullhorn had been taken by the Guard from the ROTC building. No effort was made to obtain Company C's assistance.¹¹ There was no teargas fired at the students, although, as noted, at least some Guardsmen, including two officers in Company G, were aware that a limited number of cannisters remained. There was no request by any Guardsman that teargas be used.

There was no request from any Guardsman for permission to fire his weapon. Some Guardsmen, including some who claimed their lives were in danger and some who fired their weapons, had their backs to the students when the firing broke out. There was no initial order to fire.¹² One Guardsman, Sgt. McManus, stated that after the firing began, he gave an order to "fire over their heads."

The Guardsmen were not surrounded. Regardless of the location of the students following them, photographs and television film show that only a very few students were located between the Guard and the commons. They could easily have continued in the direction in which they had been going. No Guardsman claims he was hit with rocks immediately prior to the firing, although one Guardsman stated that he had to move out of the way of a three inch "log" just prior to the time that he heard shots. Two Guardsmen allege that they were hit with rocks after the firing began. One student alleges that immediately subsequent to the shooting he moved to the Guard's position and looked for rocks and other debris. He claims he saw only a few.

Although many claim they were hit with rocks at some time during the confrontation, only one Guardsman, Lawrence Shafer, was injured on May 4, 1970, seriously enough to require any kind of medical treatment. He admits his injury was received some 10 to 15 minutes before the fatal volley was fired. His arm, which was badly bruised, was put in a sling and he was given medication for pain. One Guardsman specifically states that the quantity of rock throwing was not as great just prior to the shooting as it had been before.

There was no sniper. Eleven of the 76 Guardsmen at Taylor Hall claim that they believed they were under sniper fire or that the first shots came from a sniper. Two lieutenants

Footnotes at end of article.

tenants of Company A, Kline and Fallon, claim they heard shots from a small caliber weapon and saw the shots hitting the ground in front of them. Lt. Fallon specifically claims the shots came from the parking lot south of Prentice Hall. Sgt. Snure of Company A was facing away from the students when, he alleges, something grazed his right shoulder. He claims it was light and fast and traveled at a severe angle to the ground near his right foot. He stated at the time he thought it might have been a bullet. Captain Martin and Sp/4 Repp of Company A claim they heard what they thought were small caliber weapons from the Johnson-Lake Hall area. Others including General Canterbury merely state the first shot was fired by a small caliber weapon.¹⁴

A few Guardsmen do not state that they thought the first shot was from a sniper, but do state that the first shot, in their opinion, did not come from an M-1 rifle; in this connection, it is alleged that the sound was muffled or that it came from what they thought was an M-79 grenade launcher, converted for firing teargas. Some construction workers also reported hearing fire from a small caliber weapon prior to the firing by the National Guard. The great majority of Guards do not state that they were under sniper fire and many specifically state that the first shots came from the National Guardsmen.

The FBI has conducted an extensive search and has found nothing to indicate that any person other than a Guardsman fired a weapon. As a part of their investigation, a metal detector was used in the general area where Lieutenants Kline and Fallon indicated they saw bullets hit the ground. A .45 bullet was recovered, but again nothing to indicate it had been fired by other than a Guardsman. Students and photographers on the roofs of Johnson and Taylor Halls state there was no sniper on the roofs.

At the time of the shooting, the National Guard clearly did not believe that they were being fired upon. No Guardsman claims he fell to the ground or took any other evasive action and all available photographs show the Guard at the critical moments in a standing position and not seeking cover. In addition, no Guardsman claims he fired at a sniper or even that he fired in the direction from which he believed the sniper shot. Finally, there is no evidence of the use of any weapons at any time in the weekend prior to the May 4 confrontation; no weapon was observed in the hands of any person other than a Guardsman, with the sole exception of Terry Norman, during the confrontation. Norman, a free lance photographer, was with the Guardsmen most of the time during the confrontation. A few students observed his weapon and claim that he fired it at students just prior to the time the Guardsmen fired. Norman claims that he did not pull his weapon until after the shooting was over and then only when he was attacked by four or five students. His gun was checked by a Kent State University Policeman and another law enforcement officer shortly after the shooting. They state that his weapon had not been recently fired.

While we do not presently know the exact nature or extent of the riot control training given to the Guardsmen on the line at Taylor Hall, most had received some training. Both Company A and Company C, 145th Infantry received at least 16 hours in riot control training in 1968 and 1969. We don't know how much training, if any, was received before that. Troop G, since September 1967 has received a total of 52 hours in riot control training—32 hours in 1967, 10 hours in 1969 and 10 hours in 1970. We do not know exactly of what lectures and demonstrations this training consisted, but we are fairly certain

that the Guardsmen were instructed to some extent in (a) Riot Control measures and the Application of Minimum Force (b) Riot Control Agents and Munitions and (c) Riot Control under extreme conditions.

Although we believe that the use of minimum force was covered in lectures, we have in our possession a copy of a briefing required to be read verbatim to all troops immediately prior to their employment in a civil disturbance. The orders which they receive are conflicting with regard to the use of weapons. The briefing provides as follows:

"f. Weapons

"(2) Indiscriminate firing of weapons is forbidden. Only single aimed shot at confirmed targets will be employed. Potential targets are:

"(c) Other. In any instance where human life is endangered by the forcible, violent actions of a rioter, or when rioters to whom the Riot Act (of Ohio) has been read cannot be dispersed by any other reasonable means, then shooting is justified."

This latter statement is in accord with Section 2923.55, Ohio Revised Code, which provides that any law enforcement officer or member of the Militia is "guiltless for killing, maiming or injuring a rioter as a consequence of the use of such force as is necessary and proper to suppress the riot or disperse or apprehend rioters." We are relatively sure that all National Guardsmen received training in the legal consequences of their actions while in an active duty status, which training included permission to fire as described above. All National Guardsmen tell us that they have authorization to fire when their lives are in danger. In order to clarify and make sense of these conflicting instructions, all Guard instructors must be interviewed in detail concerning their lectures regarding the discharge of weapons into a crowd of persons.

Each person who admits firing into the crowd has some degree of experience in riot control. None are novices. Staff Sergeant Barry Morris has been in the Guard for 5 years, 3 months. He has received at least 60 hours in riot control training and has participated in three previous riots. James Pierce has spent 4 years, 9 months in the Guard. He has an unknown, but probably substantial, number of hours of riot control training and has participated in one previous riot. Lawrence Shafer has been in the Guard for 4½ years. He has received 60 hours of riot control training and has participated in three previous riots. Ralph Zoller has been in the Guard for 4 years. He has received 60 hours of riot training and has participated in three previous riot situations. James McGee has been in the Guard for 4 years, 7 months. He has received 60 hours of riot training and has participated in two previous riots. All are in G Troop. We do not know how much, if any, riot control training or experience William Herschler has.

In trying to solve the puzzle of the location of the students prior to the shooting, we observed many photographs and contact strips obtained during the investigation by the FBI. There is, however, a curious lack of photographs from the time the Guard left the practice football field until the time of the shooting. We do have at least 3 photographs of this period that are helpful. They are attached to this report. The first is a photograph of a portion of the parking lot south of Prentice Hall and of a portion of the hill in front of Taylor Hall taken within an estimated 15-30 seconds prior to the firing. The second photograph was taken from Taylor Hall immediately after the shooting started and while it was going on. It shows victim Joseph Lewis standing 20 yards away from the Guard just before he was shot. The third photograph was taken from Prentice Hall shortly after the shooting was over. No crowd or mass of people—close to the Guard

or otherwise—is identifiable in this photograph. We do not know exactly how long after the shooting this picture was taken.

A minimum of 54 shots were fired by a minimum of 29 of the 78 members of the National Guard at Taylor Hall in the space of approximately 11 seconds. Fifteen members of Company A admit they fired but all claim that they fired either in the air or into the ground. However, William Herschler of Company A is alleged by Sergeant McManus of his Company to have emptied his entire clip of 8 rounds into the crowd—firing semi-automatically. The National Guard says his weapon was fired and Herschler, who was taken to the hospital after the shooting suffering from hypertension, kept repeating in the ambulance that he had "shot two teenagers." We do not yet know who checked Herschler's weapon to determine whether it was fired. The only two members of Company C who were on the southeast side of Taylor Hall admit they fired their weapons but claim they did not fire at the students.

Seven members of Troop G admit firing their weapons, but also claim they did not fire at the students. Five persons interviewed in Troop G, the group of Guardsmen closest to Taylor Hall, admit firing a total of eight shots into the crowd or at a specified student.

SP/4 James McGee claimed that it looked to him like the demonstrators were overrunning the 107th. He then saw one soldier from Company A fire four or five rounds from a .45 and saw a sergeant from Troop G also fire a .45 into the crowd. He claims he then fired his M-1 twice over the heads of the crowd and later fired once at the knee of a demonstrator when he realized the shots were having no effect.

SP/4 Ralph Zoller claims he heard a muffled shot which he alleges came from a sniper. Thereafter he heard the National Guard shoot and he fired one shot in the air. He then knelt, aimed and fired at the knee of a student who he claims looked as if he was throwing an object at Zoller.

SP/4 James Pierce, a Kent State student, claims that the crowd was within ten feet of the National Guardsmen. He then heard a shot from the National Guard. He then fired four shots—one into the air; one at a male ten feet away with his arm drawn back and a rock in his hand (this male fell and appeared to get hit again); he then turned to his right and fired into the crowd; he turned back to his left and fired at a large Negro male about to throw a rock at him.

Staff Sergeant Barry Morris claims the crowd advanced to within 30 feet and was throwing rocks. He heard a shot which he believes came from a sniper. He then saw a 2nd Lieutenant step forward and fire his weapon a number of times. Morris then fired two shots from his .45 "into the crowd."

Sergeant Lawrence Shafer heard three or four shots come from his "right" side. He then saw a man on his right fire one shot. He then dropped to one knee and fired once in the air. His weapon failed to eject and he had to eject the casing manually. He then saw a male with bushy, sandy hair, in a blue shirt (Lewis) advancing on him and making an obscene gesture (giving the finger). This man had nothing in his hands. When this man was 25-35 feet away, Shafer shot him. He then fired three more times in the air.

In addition to Herschler, at least one person who has not admitted firing his weapon, did so. The FBI is currently in possession of four spent .45 cartridges which came from a weapon not belonging to any person who admitted he fired. The FBI has recently obtained all .45's of persons who claimed they did not fire, and is checking them against the spent cartridges.

In addition, the Guardsman previously mentioned who was interviewed by a reporter from the Knight newspaper chain told the

Footnotes at end of article.

interviewer that he "closed his eyes" after other Guardsmen fired and that he, too, fired one shot "into the crowd." Of all Guardsmen who admit firing into the crowd, the physical description of this unknown Guardsman might match only that of William Zoller. However, it is likely that it is not Zoller. Zoller's story to the FBI does not match that of this unknown Guardsman.

The reaction by the leadership of the National Guard was immediate when the shooting began. Both Major Jones and General Canterbury immediately ordered a cease fire and kept repeating that order. Major Jones ran out in front of the Guardsmen and began hitting their weapons with his baton. Some Guardsmen (unknown as yet) had to be physically restrained from continuing to fire their weapons.

Sergeant Robert James of Company A, assumed he'd been given an order to fire, so he fired once in the air. As soon as he saw that some of the men of the 107th were firing into the crowd, he ejected his remaining seven shells so he would not fire any more. Sergeant Ruby Morris of Troop G prepared to fire his weapon but stopped when he realized that the "rounds were not being placed." Sergeant Richard Love of Company C fired once in the air, then saw others firing into the crowd; he asserted he "could not believe" that the others were shooting into the crowd, so he lowered his weapon.

When the firing began, many students began running; others hit the ground. Because they believed the National Guard was firing blanks, some remained standing until they heard bullets striking around them. The firing continued for about 11 seconds.

Four students were killed, nine others were wounded, three seriously. Of the students who were killed, Jeff Miller's body was found 85-90 yards from the Guard. Allison Krause fell about 100 yards away. William Schroeder and Sandy Scheuer were approximately 130 yards away from the Guard when they were shot.

Although both Miller and Krause had probably been in the front ranks of the demonstrators initially, neither was in a position to pose even a remote danger to the National Guard at the time of the firing. Sandy Scheuer, as best as we can determine, was on her way to a speech therapy class. We do not know whether Schroeder participated in any way in the confrontation that day.

Miller was shot while facing the Guard. The bullet entered his mouth and exited at the base of the posterior skull. Both Krause and Scheuer were shot from the side. The bullet that killed Allison Krause penetrated the upper left arm and then into the left lateral chest. The bullet which killed Sandy Scheuer entered the left front side of her neck and exited the right front side. William Schroeder was shot while apparently in a prone position, facing away from the Guard. The bullet entered his left back at the 7th rib and some fragments exited at the top of his left shoulder.

Of nine students who were wounded, Joseph Lewis was probably the closest to the Guard. He was shot while making an obscene gesture about 20 yards from the National Guard. Two bullets struck Lewis. One entered his right lower abdomen and exited from his left buttock. The second projectile caused a through and through wound in Lewis' lower left leg, about four inches above the ankle.

John Cleary was located by a metal sculpture in front of Taylor Hall approximately 37 yards from the National Guard when he was shot. He was apparently standing laterally to the Guard and facing Taylor Hall when he was shot. The bullet entered his left upper chest and the main fragments exited from the right upper chest.

Allen Canfora was positioned by the FBI about 75 yards away from the Guard when he received a through and through wound of the right wrist.¹⁵ His injury was minor.

Dean Kahler was located about 95-100 yards from the Guard when he was shot. Kahler was struck in the left posterior side and the projectile, traveling slightly from back to front and from above to below, fractured three vertebrae. Kahler is currently paralyzed from the waist down. He will probably remain a paraplegic.

Douglas Wrentmore was located about 110 yards from the Guard when he was shot. The bullet entered the left side of Wrentmore's right knee, caused a compound fracture of the right tibia and exited on the right side of the knee.

Donald MacKenzie was shot while running in the opposite direction from the Guard. He was approximately 245-250 yards away from the Guard. The projectile which struck MacKenzie entered the left rear of his neck, struck his jawbone and exited through his cheek. Dr. Ewing, MacKenzie's attending physician, has expressed an opinion that MacKenzie was not shot by a projectile from a military weapon. This opinion has been challenged in an unsubstantiated newspaper article by other physicians on a purely theoretical basis. No bullet fragments were available for analysis.

James Russell was wounded near the Memorial Gymnasium, an area 90 degrees removed from the locations of other students who were shot. He was about 125-130 yards from the Guard when he was shot. He had two wounds—a small puncture wound in the right thigh which may have been caused by a projectile; however, no projectile was located; the other wound was located on the right forehead. A very small projectile is still located in Russell's head. We theorize that it may have been caused by 7½ birdshot. His injuries were minor.

Two other students, Thomas Grace and Robert Stamps, were wounded but as of yet, we have been unable to place either with any accuracy on the field. We are relatively sure that Stamps was shot while he was in the parking lot south of Prentice Hall. He was probably about 165 yards away when he was shot. The projectile struck Stamps from the rear in the right buttock and penetrated four inches. The attending physician expressed the opinion that Stamps was struck by a projectile from a low velocity weapon but the FBI's lab analysis shows the bullet came from a military weapon.

Thomas Grace was shot in the back of the left ankle and fragments from the projectile exited from the top of his foot. The FBI has tentatively placed Grace directly in front of the Guard at a distance of 20 yards from them. However, it is noted that the Akron Beacon Journal placed Grace in the parking lot south of Prentice Hall—over 100 yards from the Guard. Since Grace has refused to place himself on the field, we have no way of knowing his position. In all, only Lewis and Miller were shot from the front. Seven students were shot from the side and four were shot from the rear.

There is no ballistics evidence to prove which Guardsmen shot which student. We can, however, show that Shafer shot Lewis, but only because their statements to the FBI coincide. We will not be able to determine who shot the other students.

Of the 13 Kent State students shot, none, so far as we know, were associated with either the disruption in Kent on Friday night, May 1, 1970, or the burning of the ROTC building on Saturday, May 2, 1970.

On the day of the shooting, Jeffrey Miller and Allison Krause can be placed at the front of the crowd taunting the National Guardsmen. Miller made some obscene gestures at the Guardsmen and Krause was heard to shout obscenities at them. Victims Grace, Canfora and Stamps were, we believe, active in taunting the Guard. Grace and Canfora probably had flags and were encouraging the students to throw rocks at the Guardsmen. Dean Kahler admitted to

the FBI that he had thrown "two or three" rocks at the Guardsmen at some time prior to the shooting. Joseph Lewis at the time of the shooting was making an obscene gesture at the Guard.

As far as we have been able to determine, Schroeder, Scheuer, Cleary, MacKenzie, Russell and Wrentmore were merely spectators to the confrontation.

Aside entirely from any questions of specific intent on the part of the Guardsmen or a predisposition to use their weapons, we do not know what started the shooting. We can only speculate on the possibilities. For example, Sergeant Leon Smith of Company A stated that he saw a man about 20 feet from him running at him with a rock. Sergeant Smith then says he fired his shotgun once in the air. He alone of all the Guardsmen does not mention hearing shooting prior to the time he fired. He asserts that "at about the same time" he fired, others fired. Some Guardsmen claim that the first shot sounded to them as if it came from a M-79 grenade launcher—a sound probably similar to that made by a shotgun.

It is also possible that the members of Troop G observed their top non-commissioned officer, Sergeant Pryor, turn and point his weapon at the crowd and followed his example. Sergeant Pryor admits that he was pointing his weapon at the students prior to the shooting but claims he was loading it and denies he fired. The FBI does not believe he fired.

Another possibility is that one of the Guards either panicked and fire first, or intentionally shot a student, thereby triggering the other shots.

FOOTNOTES

¹ [Location of footnote in text not indicated.] There is no information that there was any violence either in the City of Kent or on the Campus during daylight hours of Saturday, May 2, 1970. Mayor Satrom stated that his decision was based upon "reports reaching the Office of the Mayor. . . ."

² Michael Weekly broke a window in the ROTC building at 2:00 a.m., May 2, 1970, apparently as the students were being forced from North Water Street onto the campus. He was arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced to 30 days for this offense.

³ Major Manley of the state police was notified in Columbus at 9:00 p.m., that the Campus situation was deteriorating. He left Columbus by helicopter.

⁴ Kent City Police were sent to the Campus at 9:30 p.m. to protect the firefighters.

⁵ One Kent police officer has stated that he saw Allison Krause about to throw a rock at the ROTC building on May 2, 1970 but he stated that he looked away before she threw it. She was the only person he could identify from the entire crowd.

⁶ We have in our possession a copy of Sections of 2923.51 and 2923.55, Ohio Revised Code which was issued by Portage County prosecutor Ronald Kane and which concerns the breaking up of assemblies. Section 2923.51 states that where five or more persons are engaged in violent or tumultuous conduct which creates a clear and present danger to the safety of persons or property, a law enforcement officer or National Guardsman shall order them to desist and disperse. Section 2923.55 provides that the law enforcement officers or National Guardsmen, when engaged in suppressing a riot or in dispersing rioters after an order to desist and disperse pursuant to Section 2923.51 has been given are guiltless for killing, maiming or injuring a rioter as a consequence of the use of proper and necessary force to suppress the riot or disperse and apprehend rioters.

It is not known when this document was issued nor to whom it was given. However, since this document concerns the ways and means preventing assemblies [sic] and is located adjacent to the modified Proclama-

tion of Civil Emergency, dated May 4, 1970, it is possible that this document was issued to the National Guard representative at the 10:00 a.m. meeting, Monday May 4, 1970.

* Apparently, the rumor was incorrect. Officials of this Institute deny that any such research was going on there.

* A few high school students who attended the Kent State University High School located on the Campus were present at this rally. A few non-students were also present—some dropouts from Kent State. The overwhelming majority of persons were, however, students enrolled at Kent State.

* The announcement for the students to disperse was made under the authority of the Proclamation of Governor Rhodes, dated April 29, 1970. This proclamation gives authority to the Adjutant General to maintain peace and order in the State of Ohio after a recitation of problems in the transportation industry in Cuyahoga, Mahoning, Summit, Lorain, Richland, Butler and Hamilton counties. No mention of Kent State University nor of Portage County is made. However, on May 5, 1970, subsequent to the shooting, the Governor amended his April 29, 1970 Proclamation to recite that the forces committed to Kent State were included in the call to active service of the April 29, 1970 Proclamation.

* Some students probably came "equipped" with bags full of rocks in anticipation of a confrontation. There are references in various interviews to people carrying bags.

* Forty-seven Guardsmen claim they did not fire their weapons. There are substantial indications that at least two and possibly more Guardsmen are lying concerning this fact.

* Company C, though it could not see Company A and Troop G, could see some of the students. We do not know but we believe that Company C still had teargas remaining.

* One Guardsman heard someone yell and believed he'd been given an order to fire. Another "thought" he heard a command to fire. He, however, claims he did not fire. Another heard a warning to "get down" just before the firing. Another "thought" he heard "someone" say "warning shots." Another "thought" he heard "someone" say "If they continue toward you, fire." Most Guardsmen heard no order and no person acknowledges giving such an order. Students on the porch of Taylor Hall close to the Guard heard no order to fire. Col. Fassinger states that all orders are given verbally and that there are no hand signals used to communicate with troops.

* General Canterbury told the FBI that the first shot came from a small caliber weapon, such as a .22. In a statement written immediately after the shooting, however, he does not specifically mention caliber or the fact that he believed the first shot was fired by a sniper, although the latter can be read into his statement.

* Canfora, however, told the FBI that he was in the parking lot when he was shot—a distance of 100 yards or greater from the Guard.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY S. TRUMAN

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following is an account of President Truman's visits to Fulton, Mo., as recorded by the Honorable Hugh P. Williamson, judge of the probate and magistrate courts, Callaway County, Fulton, Mo., in "Memories of Friendships," from the

Fulton Sun-Gazette, on December 26, 1972:

MEMORIES OF FRIENDSHIPS, POLITICAL TIES IN
CALLAWAY

(By Hugh P. Williamson)

Margaret Truman Daniel, in her book "Harry S. Truman," is reported by the press to have stated that her father did not want to become President "by the back door." By this she meant that he did not want to move into the Presidency from the position of Vice-President by the death of the incumbent, which of course is exactly what he did. An experience that I had with Mr. Truman provides some interesting information on this matter. I was a delegate from Missouri to the 1944 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. There was before the convention only one question to be resolved and that was the candidate for Vice-President, since it was assumed that Mr. Roosevelt would be renominated. For a number of days following the convening of the convention very little was done. Tiring of this inactivity I went one morning to Mr. Truman's suite in the old Stephens Hotel. He was alone except for a political hanger-on of no importance. I motioned for Truman to come out into the hall, which he did. These halls were very wide and very high and on this morning were completely deserted. Mr. Truman leaned up against the wall, stuck out his right leg, and, with the foot resting on the heel, began to rotate the toe of the shoe from right to left and left to right at a fairly moderate rate, somewhat like the pendulum of a clock upside down. I stated the obvious, which was that there was a vast amount of inaction and asked him if it would be agreeable to him if a committee from the Missouri Delegation visited other state delegations in an attempt to get them to endorse him. At this suggestion the toe of the shoe rapidly increased in motion, he remained silent for as much as half a minute, and then said, in a very low voice, "I am not sure that I want it." My reply was, "You have no doubt seen Mr. Roosevelt recently and you must surely realize that whoever gets the nomination for Vice-President here will be President sometime within the next four years." At this point the toe of the shoe accelerated to very rapid motion indeed, and after perhaps a full minute had passed he straightened up, put his mouth practically inside my ear, and in a low whisper said, "Well, go ahead." While all of this was going on the hall continued to be completely deserted!

I did "go ahead," the result of my efforts were completely nil, I have no illusion that I was in any sense a President maker, but I believe that this incident throws an interesting light upon Mr. Truman's attitude toward going into the Presidency "by the back door."

I also have reason to believe that Mr. Truman never did like his role as Vice-President or consider that it was very important. My reason for so believing is a letter in my possession from Truman dated April 6, 1945. This letter reads:

"OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1945.

Mr. HUGH P. WILLIAMSON,
Prosecuting Attorney, Callaway County,
Fulton, Mo.

DEAR HUGH: Thanks a lot for your good letter of the third.

I am certainly glad to have the reactions which you gave me on the various phases of the State administration.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Keep sending 'em. Tell Tom VanSant that just because I've become a political eunuch he needn't strike me from his list."

Six days after writing this letter, in which he refers to himself as "a political eunuch," as President of the United States he occupied the most powerful position of any man in the world! On August 6th following he

ordered an atomic bomb to be dropped on Hiroshima and three days later another on Nagasaki. The combined mortality of these bombs was somewhere between four and five hundred thousand people. The "political eunuch" had indeed become a man of vast power.

Where and when I first met Harry Truman I do not remember, but it was doubtless at some of the many Democratic meetings which we both attended. By the time he made his first race for the United States Senate we were rather well acquainted. During the early summer of that year, which was 1934, I met Truman and his close friend, Major Harry Vaughn, on the steet in Fulton. This was about ten o'clock in the morning, and after discussing the local political situation, Truman said that he and Vaughn were about to leave for Excelsior Springs, where they had a political meeting scheduled for two o'clock that afternoon. Truman then said in a jocular but unfortunately truthful manner, "You do not have any law business, I imagine, so if you want to come with me and Harry we would be glad to have you, and after the meeting you can hitch-hike back to Fulton." We proceeded to the Elms Hotel in Excelsior, washed up, ate a light lunch, and about 1:30 went to the meeting place in a small park back of the hotel. There was nobody present, time went on, two o'clock came, 2:15, and still nobody! My embarrassment for Mr. Truman increased in proportion to the passage of time, but it was not shared by him. Finally, at about a quarter of three, I expressed rather strongly my feeling about the Democrats in Clay County for not coming to the meeting. Mr. Truman blandly said that he guessed that they had something better to do! He and Vaughn drove me out to the highway, they wheeled off in the direction of Kansas City, and in the early hours of the next morning I reached Fulton. I was astonished at his apparent unconcern, his acceptance of what I considered to be a reasonable action on the part of the local Democrats, and his calm acceptance of human nature being what it was. I think that this attitude may have been one of the main-springs that propelled him to prominence and that enabled him, in later years, to pursue a calm and steady course while the political and social seas raged furiously and unceasingly about him.

I may here note that while Truman did have the endorsement of Tom Pendergast, the political boss of Missouri, I did not believe that Pendergast furnished him with any financial assistance because surely no man ever made the race for the United States Senate in Missouri on a more scanty campaign budget. On several occasions of which I knew, his campaign was sharply curtailed by this lack. On one such occasion a large amount of mail which had been prepared could not be sent because there was no money to buy stamps! I heard of numerous other such situations. I may also add that for many years Truman walked somewhat under the shadow of his association with Pendergast. In 1943 the Republican National Committee sent an investigative team to Kansas City in an attempt to find evidences of corruption in the public career of Truman, which included being Road Overseer of Jackson County and judge of the Jackson County court. After about five months of intensive work they came up with absolutely nothing. And to me this has always been another amazing facet of this amazing man: that he could live with the Pendergast corruption and not be corrupted. But he very clearly did.

Sometime during Truman's tenure as Senator an important Democratic meeting was scheduled to be held at Convention Hall in Kansas City. I went up for the meeting and stayed at the Muehlbach Hotel. The morning of the meeting, dressed—immaculately, I left the hotel with Truman and some men whom I have forgotten, to go to the meeting.

As we started up the street I was a short distance ahead of the other two, and met, coming down the street, a little eight or nine year old boy, ragged, extremely dirty, forlorn looking indeed! His nose was very badly in need of being blown, the lace of one of his tattered shoes had come undone, and at every other step he tripped on it. I made a wide detour around him because I did not want my immense cleanliness and impeccable appearance to be contaminated by any near approach to him. When Truman came up he did not detour around this pitiful small object but went directly up to him, knelt on one knee on the dirty sidewalk, jerked a white handkerchief out of his pocket, blew the nose, tied the shoe lace, gave the little fellow a friendly pat on the behind, pressed a handful of change into his grimy hand, and smiling broadly came on up the street.

A few years later I had what has always seemed to me to be a very amusing incident with relation to Truman. In Kansas City, for many years, there lived a distant relative of mine named John T. Barker. Barker had been Attorney General of Missouri, Speaker of the Missouri House, and almost got the Democratic nomination for Governor. He had been a Chautauqua lecturer, and was one of the most prominent lawyers in Missouri. His life had been highly active and quite colorful. In his later years, he and I became quite intimate. In the later summer of 1943 he sent me, literally, nearly a bushel of notes, some typewritten, some written in longhand, regarding his life and many experiences. They were accompanied by a letter with the request to "make these into a book when you get time." The thought appeared to be that this could be done on some not very busy weekend. In fact I spent almost a year in my spare time, on this very interesting project. In September of 1948, preceding the Truman-Dewey election, I finished work on this manuscript after considerable revision and numerous conferences with Barker. One of the chapters was entitled, "A New Client Named Truman." I sent the book to an Eastern publisher and about a week before the election I received a letter from the publisher stating that they would accept the book, but adding that the chapter on Truman must come out because, "after the election nobody will be interested in Truman." Obviously they not only took the chapter out but threw it away because a few days after the election I received a wire from the publishers with the terse request, "Please send us the chapter on Truman." I sent the chapter which appears as Chapter Twenty-One in the book, "A Missouri Lawyer."

I wish to quote to some extent from a portion of this chapter for a number of reasons. One is that it gives Barker's evaluation of Truman. This evaluation I believe is one which would have been generally shared by people who knew Truman intimately, as Barker did. Another feature of Truman, which Barker speaks of, was his very great, almost childish it seemed to me, admiration of lawyers and his deep regret that he was not one of that controversial brotherhood. The other incident related by Barker is illustrative of the perfect and rock-like integrity of Truman. Barker writes:

"More than intellectual brilliance, more than cleverness, more than education, Americans appreciate basic honesty. Certainly this country and no country in all recorded time has ever had a chief executive who possesses this fine quality of greater degree than Harry S. Truman. This fact is illustrated by many incidents in his career, only two of which I will mention.

In the early '20's he was studying in the Kansas City Night School of Law. He carried on these studies for nearly three years. In those times examination for a license to practice law in Missouri was lax and nearly anyone could be admitted even without examination. He had a very great desire to

become a lawyer and could very easily have received his license, as he well knew, but since he did not have all of the technical requirements provided by law, he did not apply for and receive something which he prized and coveted very much, although it could have been his for the asking.

Another instance which is even more illustrative of this point is furnished by the old family farm in Jackson County. Prior to the depression his mother owned a splendid farm of 360 acres about ten miles from Kansas City. His father was dead and his mother an aged woman. In the early '30's she mortgaged this farm for \$30,000 at which time it was well worth the amount of the mortgage. As is too well known the depression ruined farm values, and the Truman mortgage, as a result of this depression, could not be paid. While a Senator of the United States, Truman saw his farm, the home of his aged mother, put up at auction and sold for the price of the mortgage. A hundred banks in Missouri would have renewed the loan for him if he had asked them to do so. Thousands of people would have carried such a mortgage for a United States Senator. He did not ask any of them to do this because he did not want to be under any obligation to anybody while he was occupying the responsible position of a Senator of the United States. I wonder how many men prominent in American public life today and in the years that are passed, would have been possessed of the integrity of Truman under these circumstances? I wonder how many of them would have seen the family farm sold at a public foreclosure sale, have seen his aged mother evicted, when by a mere gesture of his hand he could have prevented it? A happy conclusion of this matter is that since the time of the foreclosure sale, a portion of this farm has been repurchased by President Truman and his mother has returned to her old home."

During the many years that I knew Truman I received many letters from him, only three of which I have preserved. The one written on April 6, 1945, has been noted. One of the remaining two is dated August 29, 1958, and was written from Independence. The letter follows:

"HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Independence, Mo., August 29, 1958.

HON. HUGH P. WILLIAMSON,
Office of the Attorney General,
Jefferson City, Mo."

DEAR HUGH: Thank you very much for your letter of the 27th.

After I had read Jerome Walsh's article in the Journal of the Missouri Bar, I wrote him a letter on the subject. Most of us in Independence thought Dr. Hyde was guilty, but, of course, I cannot blame Jerome for protecting his father in the matter. His article is a good one.

I am glad that you told me about Mrs. VanSant, and I am sorry that she is not in good health.

That book of yours is sure to be a good one, and I would like very much to have a copy for the Library.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN,

I wrote Mrs. VanSant.

The reference to Dr. Hyde was in regard to one of the most celebrated murder trials ever held in Missouri. Dr. Ben C. Hyde lived and practiced in Independence, and was married to one of the Swope girls, of the family that gave Swope Park to Kansas City. One fall Colonel Swope, an uncle, Chrisman Swope, a brother, and two sisters became ill with typhoid fever and died. Dr. Hyde was charged with inoculating these people with typhoid germs in order to inherit the Swope fortune. Jerome Walsh was the son of the man that prosecuted Hyde, without success, due to a sequence of bizarre circumstances. The Mrs. VanSant referred to was the widow of the

Tom VanSant referred to in the letter of April 6, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,

Independence, Mo., July 16, 1959.

HON. HUGH P. WILLIAMSON,
Assistant Attorney General,
State of Missouri."

DEAR HUGH: I was happy to receive the brochure about your new book, The Overland Diary of James A. Pritchard from Kentucky to California in 1849, and I know that it will be a very interesting publication.

If you will let me know when it comes out, I'll invest in a copy.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The book to which Truman refers was one which I had written and was soon to be published.

While I was writing the Barker story, in the comparative quiet of my study, and relieving with him the interesting events of his career, Truman was engaged in a life-or-death political struggle with Governor Thomas E. Dewey of New York, for the election to the Presidency. All opinion polls and large segments of the press predicted a Dewey victory. Truman, characteristically, and again putting principle above politics, had previously taken a very strong stand in favor of Civil Right Legislation, indifferent to political consequences, and against the urgings of his political advisors. The consequences were that this had lost him the support of a large group of Southern Democrats. Truman, almost alone, never seemed to doubt that he would win. He did, and carried with him a Democratic majority in both the House and Senate. The Literary Digest, whose poll showed a Dewey victory by a wide margin, was so discredited by the election of Truman that it ceased publication soon afterward.

That there have been many men in American public life who had more mental power, scope, and brilliance than Truman would not, I believe, be questioned. That there have been many who were far better educated is plain. That there were many who had a far greater knowledge and understanding of affairs, both domestic and foreign, but especially foreign, is true. But that there are any who possessed his perfect and rock-like integrity; his understanding of the heart and soul of his country and countrymen; his identification with the masses of our people; his total courage, both physical and moral; his knowledge of men; his vast and encompassing common sense, I very much doubt. And in a highly difficult and critical period in the history of our country, these qualities proved to be sufficient.

OUTRAGED OVER "EXIT FEES"

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution respectfully urging the President to convey to the Soviet Union our grave concern over the injustices which that country has perpetrated against her Jewish citizens and to urge the U.S.S.R. to immediately provide the fair and equitable treatment that the Soviet Jewry has for so long been denied.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express once again my concern and outrage over the "exit fees" which have been imposed on Jews wishing to emigrate to Israel. These exit fees which are as-

sessed on a sliding scale ranging from \$5,000 to \$37,000 per person are nothing less than ransom fees which are in direct contradiction with established international law.

The right of any person to emigrate to the nation of his choice is fundamental and is secured by the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, the U.S.S.R. ignores that doctrine even though it is a signatory of the U.N. agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon us, as well as all free people, to express in no uncertain terms to the Soviet Government our determination to see these ransom fees eliminated once and for all.

It is time to mobilize the strength of world opinion on behalf of the oppressed Jewish minority. I believe that the House of Representatives and the United States should take the lead in this matter.

Soviet Jewry has been stripped of its property, denied even the most basic freedoms and exiled from the mainstream of Soviet life. It is incredible that, in order to escape from this enslaved and dehumanizing condition, they must shoulder the additional burden of exorbitant exit taxes. Obviously, only a handful of Jews can emigrate under these conditions.

Thus, while the U.S.S.R. boasts that exit visas are readily available for all, in fact, they are more difficult than ever before to obtain.

Mr. Speaker, judging by the events of the recent past, it appears that each time the spotlight of world attention is focused on the plight of the Soviet Jews, the U.S.S.R. takes appropriate but temporary steps to improve their status. Once that pressure is released, they return to the repressions and injustices of the past.

Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that the House of Representatives act immediately on my resolution. We must serve notice that we and the rest of the free world will not stand for temporary or false promises. The Soviet Union must let the Jewish people go and they must let them go now, without fear of their lives or the loss of their property.

HENRY McKNIGHT: MAN OF VISION

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, all of us who knew him were saddened by the death on December 30 of Henry T. McKnight, of Wayzata, Minn., a former State Senator and developer of the new towns of Jonathan, in my congressional district, and of Cedar-Riverside in Minneapolis.

Henry was an extraordinary man whose driving, visionary leadership has left a lasting mark upon our State of Minnesota. Both the Minneapolis Tribune and Minneapolis Star commented recently on Henry's life and career, and I insert these well-deserved memorials in the Record at this point in my remarks:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Jan. 4, 1973]

HENRY T. McKNIGHT

Henry T. McKnight was a man of vision, and that vision encompassed the importance of preserving both man's cultural heritage and his legacy of natural resources. It led him to work untiringly for environmental and conservation legislation during his career as a state senator—a career that was crowned by his sponsorship of the landmark Omnibus Natural Resources and Recreation Act of 1963. It led him, too, to the active support of the arts, and of organizations dedicated to them.

But the greatest evidence of his vision can be seen in the "new towns" he was developing at the time of his death last week: Jonathan, a pioneering effort to prove that thousands of people can live, work and take their recreation in a rolling, country setting without doing damage to that setting; and Cedar-Riverside, a "new town in town" that attempts to combine the best of the new with the best of the old, and to make room for the diversity of human activity that makes urban life urbane.

Mr. McKnight's vision as a developer perceived the need to consider the totality of an environment—not only the buildings he would put up, but also the land on which they stood and the activities of the people living and working within them. It was a concept he believed in enough to back it with his own money. Jonathan and Cedar-Riverside embody Mr. McKnight's vision—and they will be his best memorials.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Jan. 3, 1973]

HENRY T. McKNIGHT

Henry T. McKnight was aware that his twin careers as an environmentalist and real estate developer were seemingly at odds. And, in truth, his attempts to combine the two sometimes drew challenges to his motives.

But his record on behalf of conservation causes—in private life, as a member of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission under President Eisenhower and as a Minnesota state senator—offered ample evidence of his commitment. He was chief author of Minnesota's 1963 natural resources act and the 1969 bill for parks, open space and flood-plain management.

His most spectacular achievements, though—the ones for which he may be best remembered and which may best represent his resolution of the developer-environmentalist "conflict"—were the successful launchings of the new towns of Jonathan and Cedar-Riverside. He saw new towns as protectors of the environment because they enable growth to be channeled where it will fit, minimizing land waste while still providing the quality of life that people want.

In many ways McKnight was a visionary. But he also was a man who, until his death last week at age 59, had the personal resources and business and political acumen to convert his dreams into realities that others might share.

WHERE SHALL THE PEOPLE LIVE?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, my people in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District are gravely concerned, as am I, over the recent orders terminating the emergency disaster loans, the REAP and Water Bank programs, the 2 percent REA loan program, and the increased imports of meats and non-fat dry milk.

These all are blows to our agricultural economy at a time when we are paying lip service to rural development.

This matter of rural development is of such widespread interest and importance that the Catholic bishops of the United States, at their recent national conference, passed a resolution on it.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and in the interest of giving this resolution the widespread readership which it deserves, I would like to insert this article from the St. Cloud Visitor, a Catholic weekly in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHERE SHALL THE PEOPLE LIVE?

The problems which today confront rural America are in many ways inseparably linked to those of urban America. Either the problems of America's rural areas and America's cities will be solved together or they will not be solved at all.

This statement is amply documented by the facts of contemporary rural and urban life. Rural poverty and urban poverty are closely related. Poverty experienced in farm communities drives many people into cities, where their presence notably contributes to urban ills. Today over 70 percent of the people in America live on less than two percent of the land. The results: air and water pollution, transportation congestion, increasing urban crime, housing shortages. Yet at the same time the movement of people from the countryside to cities is continuing often under the pressure of forces which make neither social nor economic sense.

Each census finds fewer farmers and weaker communities. Nearly two-thirds of all the ill-housed in our nation are in rural America. Education, health benefits, and other services in rural America lag behind those available in urban America. Many communities in the countryside are dying due to declining population; the people left behind find it increasingly difficult to sustain already inadequate standards of living. At the same time agricultural conglomerates are expanding, raising the possibility of their taking over virtually all farming in the United States. Few Americans seem unaware of this development, and fewer still are concerned with the fundamental question of its desirability.

In 1973 the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, which in 1968 became part of the United States Conference as its Division of Rural Life, marks its 50th anniversary. As a result of the vision of its founder, Archbishop Edwin O'Hara, and the hard work of leaders such as Monsignor Luigi Ligutti, it has played an important role in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States. However, many of the problems which brought this agency into existence not only continue to exist today but if anything are more acute than they were 50 years ago. The United States faces pressing challenges concerning population distribution, economic opportunity, and the conservation of natural resources. These are issues with significant moral and spiritual implications, which demand the serious attention of all Americans and, in particular, the nation's churches. In view of this we wish, on this 50th anniversary of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, to address ourselves to some of the central questions which today confront rural America—and all America—in the belief that the future of our nation's cities and suburbs, as well as its rural communities, will be determined in large measure by the answers which Americans give to them.

THE PROBLEM

Rooted in the pioneering efforts of rural leaders of the Church, the work of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference

throughout its 50-year history has been directed to the spiritual, social and economic betterment of rural people. This commitment has been founded not only on the belief that rural Americans are entitled to the same material and cultural advantages as other Americans, but also on the conviction that the best interests of the entire nation are served when the needs and aspirations of rural America are met.

Today, however, the issue is not simply the well-being of farm people but their very existence as a people. In recent years hundreds of thousands of farm families have been forced off the land by low prices, soaring costs and high taxes. There are fewer than three million farms in the United States today, a decrease of more than 25 percent in a decade. It has been predicted that, if present trends continue, within 15 years about half of America's farmers, efficient though small, will quit the land, leaving production largely in the hands of big farms and corporations.

Some claim that the alleged efficiency of the large farm conglomerates—an efficiency which has never been proven—permits them to drive farm people from the land to the cities. In honesty, those who advance such claims should include in their cost accounting the vastly increased expenditures needed to meet the needs of these new urban poor. They should include the social and human costs resulting from the needless shift of population from vacated farm homes to overcrowded cities and suburbs. They should include the ecological damage to soil, water and food produced by attitudes and practices that treat agriculture as an industrial venture rather than a biological enterprise.

Such trends in American agriculture, and the huge social costs that accompany them, should not be written off simply as inevitable consequences of technological progress. Technology is a factor in the situation but it need not have these results. At its heart this is a question of social policy to be weighed and decided by the American people. Agricultural technology could be used to produce more socially beneficial developments than those we have witnessed to date. It could, for example, be employed to strengthen the commercial family farm of moderate size which, up to now, has provided Americans with an abundance of food and fiber at very low cost without disruption of the God-given ecological balance in nature. It could provide farm families with a host of sorely needed social advantages without driving them off the land. It could foster the growth of rural industry and rural area development. It could bring increased cultural opportunities and expanded health facilities to the countryside.

The general failure of these benefits to materialize in rural America up to now is not the result of technological or social necessity, but of mistaken policy and practice. *Laissez-faire* and adaptive approaches to farm problems must now be repudiated and rejected. The *laissez-faire* approach allows harsh forces of uncontrolled competition to drive less prosperous farmers out of agriculture. The adaptive approach goes so far as to employ that powerful influence of government and educational institutions, including land grant universities, to accelerate the migration of families from the land. This should not be permitted to happen.

THE SOLUTION

In face of such powerful influences and interests the individual farmer is helpless. His "solitary voice," as Pope John XXIII said, "speaks to the winds." (Mater et Magistra, 146) It is essential for farmers to unite and cooperate, as the Pope emphasized in his great encyclical. In light of this there is

critical need for the great farm organizations—the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the National Farmers Organization, the Grange—as well as commodity groups and farm workers, to set aside their differences and join in an effective united effort based on the positive contribution that each can make to rural America. Without such unity the efforts of farmers to secure fair prices and beneficial farm legislation are likely not to succeed in time to check the movement of people from the countryside to crowded cities. Unless they stand together, their voices will go unheard in the halls of government where decisions affecting their future are made.

Other forms of cooperation among farmers are also needed. "It is necessary that farmers form among themselves mutual aid societies; that they establish professional associations," (Mater et Magistra, 143) Many such organizations, of which cooperatives are a notable example now exist. But they should exhibit a stronger Christian commitment to support the smaller producer and businessman. This is the view of Pope John, and has been the view of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference for five decades.

There is need, too, for farmers to join hands with other members of the rural community to work for common goals. Farm workers, for so long the most forgotten laboring men in America, are now seeking allies in their efforts to achieve a decent standard of living for themselves and their families. Rural small businessmen are dependent on the maintenance of a rural population base for their livelihood. All these, the people of rural America, must acknowledge their interdependence and join in efforts on behalf of the common good.

In recent years government has shown increased sensitivity to the needs of rural people and greater willingness to address those needs. In particular, Congress deserves commendation for the recent steps it has taken in this regard. At the same time, however, legislators and government officials must continue to examine the social and economic trends in rural America and evaluate their consequences for the nation. Our laws still embody many injustices which discriminate against family farmers, farm workers and the rural poor. For example, our tax laws still permit "write-off" advantages for those who invest in farming merely to offset profits from other sources and our labor relations and labor standards laws still exclude or extend only limited protections to farm workers. These, and all such injustices should be remedied as soon as possible.

Prompt legislative action is required to assist family farmers and inhibit the further expansion of giant farm corporations. This should include prohibiting laws, effective limits on federal payments for land retirement and crop reduction, and even graduated land taxes. Although such legislation may be regarded as controversial by some, it is surely preferable to inaction, whose consequence would be to create in the United States the situation which today exists in some other countries, where ownership of the land has fallen into the hands of a few, leading to discontent among the landless and to angry demands for land reform. The current trend in land ownership is a serious social issue that demands the urgent attention of all Americans.

Appropriate legislative action to keep the land in the hands of those who work it will, however, be only a first step, albeit an essential one. It must be accompanied by continuing efforts on the part of public and private agencies and rural people themselves to ensure an adequate economic base

for rural communities. Lacking such a base, the socially important objectives of widely diffused ownership of the land will not be realized. We feel that the wide ownership of land is vital to the future of America. In the words of Pope John, "Today more than ever the wider distribution of private ownership ought to be forcefully championed." (Mater et Magistra, 115)

Equitable prices for agricultural products are of first importance in creating and maintaining the base. Also needed are efforts to foster rural industry and develop common services in rural communities for preserving farm products. (Cf. Mater et Magistra, 141). The rural economy could be further strengthened by other small industries, tourism, and the development of recreational facilities. Accomplishing these objectives will require the creation of closer, cooperative relationships among the rural communities.

Today, fortunately, more and more Americans are coming to realize that our nation, blessed with an abundance of land, must yet make better use of its green space so that migration from countryside to city will be greatly reduced, for the sake of both. The further congestion of urban areas can only complicate their problems while the problems of the countryside grow simultaneously more acute. The needs of rural Americans must be met—and met in rural America—by providing them with more opportunity for the management of their own economic affairs.

Such an opportunity can be guaranteed through increased ownership of property and through mutual self-help organizations such as cooperatives.

The Church can play a unique leadership role in promoting these changes in rural America. In spite of the decreasing population base, it must maintain and strengthen its ministry to farm and rural people and articulate the redeeming message of Christ in terms of the spiritual values inherent in their way of life. Through pastoral training in our seminaries and through programs of continuing education, it must educate priests to the socio-economic realities of rural America and prepare them to exercise a role of rural community leadership.

For half a century the National Catholic Rural Life Conference has sought to make its policies operative through diverse programs. It has long been an educator in rural values through workshops, lectures and literature. It has fostered the development of liturgy oriented to rural concerns. It has advocated government programs and policies which better meet the needs of rural people. Through diocesan rural life directors it has sponsored many local-level programs and observances. In the South and Southwest, in Appalachia and overseas, it has cooperated in countless projects to encourage self-help efforts among the poor.

As the National Catholic Rural Life Conference marks its 50th anniversary we extend our congratulations and thanks to its board, staff and members for their efforts over the years. Problems of urbanization, farm production, and rural poverty continue to oppress people in our nation and abroad; and we shall continue to look to the Rural Life Conference for leadership in carrying out the mission of the Church in these areas. The ministry of the Church is a shared one, and it is through agencies such as the National Catholic Rural Life Conference that the people of God can most effectively participate in this shared responsibility. As we unite our intention with those of the Rural Life Conference on this anniversary, we invite all people of good will to join with us in efforts to ensure that renewed commitment today will lead to a better, more just world tomorrow.

INDONESIA'S STATE OIL ENTERPRISE DEMONSTRATES GOOD BUSINESS JUDGMENT AND MATURE ECONOMIC ATTITUDE

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in view of the mounting interest in the critical area of natural resources, particularly that of fossil fuels, I would like to bring to your attention an address by Dr. Ibnu Sutowo, president-director of the Indonesian State Oil & Gas Mining Enterprise.

The unique Indonesian production sharing system, adapted to their national aspirations, differs from that of other oil producing countries, many of whose governments and oil companies are engaged in a series of confrontations regarding pricing and other problems.

Pertamina, with the aid of U.S. capital investment, has been an expanding and successful venture, and I include at this point the text of Dr. Sutowo's speech:

PERTAMINA AND INDONESIA'S INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES

(Speech by Lt. General Dr. Ibnu Sutowo)

Mr. Ambassador, Madame Thajeb and distinguished guests:

It is a privilege to be here tonight and to have the opportunity of joining Ambassador Thajeb in welcoming all of you to the celebration of such an important double anniversary.

Fifteen years ago when I was directed to form an Indonesian state oil company, we had only a goal and a vision. People scoffed at the idea that from a heap of scrap iron and a few old devastated fields left by the ravages of the second world war and our own struggle for independence, we could build the fully integrated national oil company to develop our country's resources which Pertamina is today.

In the beginning there were few people who were willing to assume the responsibility for the internal development and rehabilitation of the national oil industry. Such a huge undertaking in the face of apparently overwhelming odds was truly staggering for a country whose people had not enough trained engineers or technicians. I was one of a relative small group of fortunate men with a university degree. My own background was that of a medical doctor caring for the needs of thousands of my people who had migrated from Java to Sumatra. The memory of the suffering of these people because of inadequate nutrition and lack of other necessities made me aware of the need for a strong, self-sufficient, independent base for my country.

During the years that have followed since our creation of Pertamina and using Indonesian manpower, we have developed to where we now operate a national oil company employing 37,000 people and staffed with university trained and experienced Indonesian engineers, geologists, technicians, and professionals in all areas.

The story of the development of our national industry is contained in a book, "Pertamina—Indonesian National Oil", which has just been published and its five American authors are among the guests tonight.

As I look back on the development of our company, I am thankful that God created Indonesia with such rich resources. And I am thankful for the opportunity to be able to develop these resources wisely. I say wisely, because it takes wisdom to find the best ways

to achieve the greatest results. This brings me to the other anniversary we are celebrating tonight—the fifth anniversary of the opening of Pertamina's representative office in the United States.

We established an American office in 1967 as the result of President Soeharto's new policies to reopen Indonesia's doors to foreign investment in order to help build our nation. We knew we had great oil potential, being one of the world's oldest oil producing countries in the world.

However, between World War II and 1965 we had dropped from fifth to twelfth place among oil producing nations. Former government policies had not created the kind of climate in which private investment flourishes—the climate of political stability with the assurance that the investor will make a worth-while profit. This was a situation we determined to rectify with rational strategies and positive policies. We knew that we did not have the capital resources or the technical know-how to develop our oil potential as quickly, and to the extent, which was so urgently needed. We actively sought out foreign oil companies to assist our state oil enterprise in exploring for oil and developing new commercial production under a mutually profitable arrangement—Production Sharing Contracts.

At the present moment, in many of the oil producing countries in the world, governments and foreign oil companies are still engaged in a series of confrontations over principles of pricing, participation and other problems. In Indonesia, since 1966 we have implemented the production sharing system which has uniquely adapted our national aspirations and specific needs to prevailing conditions. Production sharing provides a workable basis for cooperation which safeguards and promotes our interests and, at the same time, is attractive to foreign oil companies as it offers them a potential for profit-making on a sound business basis. After operating for six years, the results prove how well this formula has worked and it has developed a great spirit of cooperation.

Since 1966 more than 40 contracts have been signed, mostly with American companies, to undertake exploration and production activities in more than three million square miles, on and offshore. Under these contracts more than a billion dollars have already been spent. In this comparatively short period Indonesian oil production has more than doubled reaching a rate of over 1,100,000 barrels a day as of May of this year, with an expected increase of an additional 40% in 1973. We anticipate reaching two million barrels per day by 1975.

Oil is the single most important domestic source for funding the Government's Five Year Development Plan, and will continue to provide the basic support for all subsequent plans. Oil earnings will contribute an estimated 40% of this year's total government budget as compared to 30% last year and will continue to grow steadily. Also the value of oil exports, will reach approximately one billion dollars this year and for the first time will exceed the total value of all other exports, thus providing most of our needed foreign exchange.

The Indonesian oil industry under the management of Pertamina has now become the world's ninth largest oil producer and seventh largest oil exporter. Since 1968 forty-three new oil and gas fields, both onshore and offshore, have been discovered several of which resulted from Pertamina's own exploration. The variety of geographical and geological areas where these fields are located justify the future expectation of discovering many more giant oil fields in addition to smaller ones.

From the viewpoint of the United States, Indonesian oil and gas will be of increasing importance in connection with the demand

for clean fuel and the energy crisis which is developing. Indonesia's crude oil has a low sulfur content which makes it extremely desirable for commercial use, especially in high pollution areas. Furthermore, several promising natural gas fields have been discovered in the last few years, opening up the prospect of exporting liquefied natural gas to the West Coast of the United States. The development of the LNG market will provide further opportunity for the participation of foreign oil companies and contractors due to the large capital requirements of such projects.

Indonesian development of petroleum is not an isolated phenomenon. Our country has made progress in every sector of the economy. We have achieved an astounding decrease of our inflation rate from 650% in 1966 to 2½% in 1971. There has been an increase of two thousand three hundred percent in domestic savings from 1968 to 1971, an overwhelming sign of confidence in our national currency. During this same period, our government expenditures for development have been increased at an average rate of 15% per year.

These are only some of the many indicators that our economic trend is steadily on its way up. These achievements have been the result of the policies established by President Soeharto to be carried out in our first Five Year Development Plan, which is now in its fourth year. In addition to restoring political stability, our policy of economic realism and pragmatism has recognized the importance and vital role of both public and private investment.

International confidence in Indonesia has been demonstrated by both government and private investors. The Inter-Governmental Group for Indonesia, an international consortium of creditor and donor countries, has rendered invaluable assistance in solving our economic problems. The role of private foreign investment is also of dynamic importance. Since the promulgation of the Law on Foreign Investment in 1967, 481 projects, outside the oil sector, have been approved by the government. They represent a total investment commitment of 1.7 billion dollars of which 554 million dollars, or 33% is United States capital.

The role of foreign capital is an expanding one. There are many opportunities for profitable investments for those who join us in realizing our tremendous economic potential and the development of our great natural resources. An illustration of this is the phenomenal growth of timber exports developed by foreign capital. The value of timber exported in 1971 was seven times that of 1969.

The Indonesian government is already planning its second Five Year Development Plan. We will accelerate all the developments started during the first Plan, and a major target is to double our development funds. This will require a great increase in the utilization of private, foreign and domestic resources. In this respect, Pertamina will play an even greater role in generating and encouraging the participation of foreign oil investment on a mutually profitable basis.

Pertamina is more than just an oil company. We are a development company for Indonesia. Since we are the nation's key industrial enterprise, and have had the most technological experience, we must take the lead in many activities. Our shareholders are all the Indonesian people. Therefore, we are engaged in a wide variety of community development activities. We have built roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, mosques, housing developments, office buildings and sport stadiums.

As a development company, Pertamina hopes that private foreign investment will not only expand in the oil sector, but be attracted to many other areas such as the development of tourist facilities. Americans are realizing what an extraordinarily beau-

tiful and interesting country Indonesia is. Last year the number of tourists, most of them American increased by 100 percent. The government is actively promoting tourism. Pertamina is also participating. For example last year, in cooperation with fifty oil and oil-related companies, we opened the Ramayana Restaurant in New York and sponsor cultural dance performances there as a means of introducing Indonesia to the restaurant visitors.

As a development company, we also recognize that if we are to develop our nation, we must develop our people. In the long run, as in the history of your own nation, it will be the quality and ability of our people that determine our national progress, rather than the quantity and value of our national resources. In the ensuing decades in Indonesia, we must use the attractiveness of our natural resources in order to develop our most important national resources which is our people.

It is not mere numbers or mere economics which will determine the future of our nation, it is the quality and the rigorosity of the challenges presented to our nation's young men that will determine our future course.

We also invite your assistance in this investment in our people. If a decade from now you can have trained—on your own, in your own system, under your own company's philosophies, sufficient Indonesian of high enough quality to handle your Indonesian operations—indeed they will perhaps be good enough to move into your international operations—you will successfully have made a great investment in our nation.

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight I have outlined our country's progress in overall economic development and in its oil sector in particular. Our potential is enormous but so are our nation's needs.

Consequently, as President Director of Pertamina, and as an Indonesian concerned with the well-being of my country, I look forward to your continuing participation in our development. We are grateful for the confidence you have placed in us as manifested by your important investments. I would like to invite those of you who have not yet done so to join us in the successes which lie ahead.

Thank you for coming this evening and I hope to welcome you in Indonesia.

LEGISLATION PROVIDING CONGRESS WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO REASSERT ITS CONTROL OVER THE EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today what I believe to be one of the most important bills that this Congress will consider. It provides Congress with an opportunity to reassert its control over the expenditure of funds—control which is being lost gradually to the executive branch.

Over the past year especially, the executive branch has used the process of impounding funds increasingly to stymie the will of Congress. Programs which have been affected now include water quality, housing, urban renewal, education, transportation, and agriculture.

When concerned Members of Congress seek an explanation for the impound-

ment of these funds, we are told that the programs involved are in the process of "internal review" by the Office of Management and Budget. More often than not, it seems to me, the review is external as well as internal, because the funds are never expended.

I feel this process of arbitrary impoundment has contributed to the constitutional crisis with which this body as an institution is now faced. It goes to the very heart of our authority—control over the expenditure of funds. The simple fact is that funds which the Congress has authorized and appropriated are being prevented from helping the people for whom they are intended. And it is even more disturbing to me that the programs most affected are "people programs" or, in other words, programs aimed at improving our environment and the basic way of life for all Americans.

The real problem, however, is not, and should not be, related to the goals or purposes for which impoundment is utilized by a particular administration. The problem is that the process is inimical to this country's ability to function as a representative democracy. I see it as a problem that every Member of this Congress regardless of party should view as a threat to the viability of our system.

Consequently, the bill which I have introduced today offers a solution to this problem which should be both acceptable and effective. It requires the President to set forth in a special message to Congress his reasons for seeking to impound funds for a specific program. Congress would then have a 60-day period in which to approve the presidential message and ratify the impoundment. If no action by the Congress were to be taken, the President would be compelled to cease the impounding of the funds.

Within the next several days, I will be contacting each of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to ask that you join with me in this bipartisan effort to reassert the congressional prerogative.

H.R. 2050

A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) whenever the President impounds any funds appropriated by law out of the Treasury for a specific purpose or project, or approves the impounding of such funds by an officer or employee of the United States, he shall, within ten days thereafter, transmit to the House of Representatives and the Senate a special message specifying—

- (1) the amount of funds impounded,
- (2) the specific projects or governmental functions affected thereby, and
- (3) the reasons for the impounding of such funds.

(b) Each special message submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each such message shall be printed as a document for each House.

Sec. 2. The President shall cease the im-

pounding of funds set forth in each special message within sixty calendar days of continuous session after the message is received by the Congress unless the specific impoundment shall have been ratified by the Congress by passage of a resolution in accordance with the procedure set out in section 4 of this Act.

Sec. 3. For purposes of this Act, the impounding of funds includes—

- (1) withholding or delaying the expenditure or obligation of funds (whether by establishing reserves or otherwise), appropriated for projects or activities, and the termination of authorized projects or activities for which appropriations have been made, and

- (2) any type of executive action which effectively precludes the obligation or expenditures of the appropriated funds.

Sec. 4. (a) The following subsections of this section are enacted by the Congress—

- (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described by this section; and they shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

- (2) with full recognition of the constitutional rights of either House to change the rules (so far relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(b) (1) For purposes of this section and section 2 the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be, which is introduced in and acted upon by both Houses before the end of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the President's message is received by that House.

- (2) The matter after the resolving clause of each resolution shall read as follows: "That the House of Representatives (Senate) approves the impounding of funds as set forth in the special message of the President dated _____, House (Senate) Document numbered _____."

(3) For purposes of this subsection and section 2, the continuity of a session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the sixty-day period.

(c) (1) A resolution introduced with respect to a special message shall not be referred to a committee and shall be privileged business for immediate consideration. It shall at any time be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(2) If the motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution is agreed to, debate on the resolution shall be limited to ten hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the resolution shall not be in order. It shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to, and it shall not be in order to move to consider any other resolution introduced with respect to the same special message.

(3) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the consideration of a resolution, and motions to proceed to the consideration

of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution shall be decided without debate.

COMMUNISTS ARE CAUSE OF BLOODSHED

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, to evaluate the recent bombing of North Vietnam, one must keep the context of the present situation firmly in mind. North Vietnam is clearly the aggressor; South Vietnam is attempting to defend itself, not to take over North Vietnam and rule it by force. The actions of North Vietnam are, therefore, immoral and ought to be condemned by all those who value human life and recognize the right of human beings to exist free from tyranny. Any actions taken by either South Vietnam or the United States in defense of South Vietnam are morally justified. The Communists are the cause of all the bloodshed and have the power to end the war at any time by merely ceasing their aggression and agreeing to a peace settlement.

One might, of course, legitimately question our initial involvement in this horrible war. But the fact remains that at present we are there and three courses of action are open to us: First, we can pull out immediately without a peace agreement; second, we can continue our limited military defensive actions while continuing to negotiate for a just peace; or third, we can increase our pressure, military or otherwise, in order to force the North Vietnamese to quickly agree to a more just peace agreement.

The first course of action appears to be advocated by many, but is totally unjustifiable on moral, humanitarian grounds. If we immediately pull out, hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese would be slaughtered by the Communists. This has happened in every other area or country taken over by force by the Communists, and the Vietnamese Communists have made it clear they intend to do the same. But even worse, from the U.S. standpoint, is that we would be leaving our prisoners of war to an uncertain fate. Our Government is responsible for putting those men over there, and it is morally responsible for doing everything possible to secure their safe and prompt return.

The second possible course of action has, in essence, been our policy throughout the entire war—use enough force to defend the South, but not enough to make the North cease their aggression. This policy has resulted in the war lasting for over 10 years and is the cause of the high number of dead and wounded on both sides. Of the three possibilities, this is worst.

The third possible course of action is,

given the context, the most rational and moral. When one is dealing with mindless brutes, who, having no grasp of the concept of human rights, attempt to rule others by force, one's only recourse is to self-defense.

This means that I support the President's current policy. Personally, however, I advocate increasing the pressure on North Vietnam. Whether this should be trade sanctions or blockades or bombing is difficult for me to say—I am not a military expert. I do know, however, that our casualties decreased in the past during periods when we were bombing the North and increased when we stopped the bombing.

I must add a word concerning those who are now crying that the bombing is immoral and that President Nixon should be compared with Adolph Hitler. These assertions are preposterous. To claim this is to deny the distinction between the aggressor and the victim, between attacking others and acting in self-defense. Such an attitude condemns those who attempt to defend their very life and their right to exist as free men and not as slaves, and therefore, sanctions the actions of the aggressor by giving him a moral status equal to that of his victims. Moral sanction is what bloody aggressors such as the North Vietnamese count on—it allows them to attack others without widespread public opposition and condemnation. People with attitudes such as this must bear a large part of the blame for the bloodshed that has resulted from the war in Vietnam.

For reasons that should now be clear, I do not and will not support any "end the war" legislation which will not allow the President the freedom to negotiate a just peace—one that will insure the return of our prisoners of war, account for our men missing in action, and achieve some protection of the people in Vietnam from Communist brutality.

CITY OF STRUTHERS, OHIO, EXPRESSES APPRECIATION FOR REVENUE SHARING FUNDS

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter and copy of a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Struthers, Ohio, which I believe will be of interest to the President and my colleagues in the 93d Congress. I, therefore, insert these documents in the Record, at this time:

THE CITY OF STRUTHERS,

Struthers, Ohio, January 10, 1973.

Hon. CHARLES J. CARNEY,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: It is gratifying to know that you as Congressman of the 19th District and your colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate, together with the President of this country recognized the financial plight of the U.S. cities throughout the nation.

It is important to express my personal gratitude and the appreciation of all the members of the Struthers, Ohio administration for the financial assistance given through the Federal General Revenue Sharing Act. As our Congressman, I hope that you will read the enclosed resolution into the Congressional Record.

Best wishes for a successful term, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE T. MACEJKO, Sr.

City Solicitor.

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING COUNCIL'S APPRECIATION TO THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND TO THE U.S. SENATE AND TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR GRANTING MONETARY ASSISTANCE TO THE CITY OF STRUTHERS, OHIO, WHICH ASSISTANCE WILL ENABLE THE CITY TO RENDER CERTAIN ESSENTIAL SERVICES TO THE PEOPLE OF STRUTHERS, OHIO

Whereas, the Congress of the United States and the President, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon have made it possible for the City of Struthers, Ohio to obtain federal financial assistance through the enactment of the Federal General Revenue Sharing Act; and

Whereas, such assistance is greatly appreciated.

Now therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the City of Struthers, Ohio three-fourths (¾) of all members elected there to concurring:

Section 1. That this Council express its appreciation to the members of the U.S. House of Representatives, members of the U.S. Senate and the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States for their leadership and recognition granted to the City of Struthers, Ohio through the allocation of Federal funds under the act identified in the caption of this resolution.

Section 2. The Clerk of this Council is directed to forward a copy of this Resolution of appreciation to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Clerk of the U.S. Senate and to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States.

Section 3. This resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed in Council this 3d day of January 1973.

THOMAS D. VASVARI,

President of Council.

DIANE M. DONATELLI,

Clerk of Council.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the mayor and City Council of Struthers for taking the time to express their gratitude for Federal efforts to assist America's cities.

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep regret upon hearing of the death of our former colleague, Oliver P. Bolton, of Ohio. I well remember his kindness and helpfulness when, together, we first entered Congress more than 20 years ago. His wife and family and particularly to his mother who was always so gracious during our years together on the Foreign Affairs Committee, my wife and I offer our sincere condolences.

RESOLUTION OF THE COUSHATTA INDIAN TRIBE

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer for your consideration the following resolution pertaining to recent problems at the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This resolution has been formally adopted by constituents of mine, the Coshatta Indian Tribe of Louisiana. The Coshatta Tribe has been working through peaceful channels for many years in an effort to improve their relationship with the Federal Government, and they have asked that I share the following statement with you:

RESOLUTION OF THE COUSHATTA INDIAN TRIBE

Whereas, the Coshatta Indian Tribe of Louisiana have always been a friendly and peaceful people who love God and their neighbors; and

Whereas, the Coshatta Tribe has never been at war with the United States and has always respected the sovereign right of the United States to govern the Coshatta people and Coshatta territory; and

Whereas, the American Indian Movement and their confederates have perpetrated malicious mischief and defamation against the American People and the Government of the United States of America; and

Whereas, the action by the American Indian Movement in Washington, D.C., resulting in the militant and unlawful seizure of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, does not represent the will or approval of the Coshatta people; and

Whereas, the American Indian Movement does not now, nor, ever in the past, hold sympathy of the Coshatta people; and

Be it resolved, that the Coshatta Indian Tribe of Louisiana, acting through the Assembly of the Coshatta People at a General Tribal Meeting, by Acclamation, whereby formally denounces the American Indian Movement, berates the American Indian Movement for the damage to the Federal Government and for the grave error in their philosophy which would motivate them to such scandalous action, and declares that the actions and methods of the American Indian Movement are not in the best interests of the Coshatta people.

The Coshatta Nation calls upon the American Indian Movement to amend their ways, return the stolen property to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and recant their treasonable action against the United States. The WILL of the Coshatta People is for all men to live as brothers in PEACE.

Thus adopted in Elton, Louisiana in the 16th day of November, 1972.

Secretary.

INDIANA DELEGATION SALUTES CULVER MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call a unique anniversary to the attention of the Members of the House. The Black Horse Troop of Culver Military Academy in Culver, Ind., will ride in its seventh Presidential Inaugural Parade in 60 years. Not only will

they appear in the parade, but they will carry the massed American flags in the protocol section leading the parade.

It is a tribute to the internationally famous college preparatory school in the district I have the honor of representing, that the Inaugural Committee selected its colorful troop to lead the parade. Ninety teenage riders from the largest equestrian unit in the United States will carry 60 American flags surrounded by a saber guard. To further emphasize Culver's tradition of inaugural appearance, The Clock, the 28-year-old lead horse of the Culver unit, has been taken out of retirement to lead the Black Horse Troop in his fifth consecutive parade.

Horsemanship is just one aspect in the varied program offered at one of the finest college preparatory schools in the country. Culver shows its confidence in tomorrow's leaders by offering its students every possible opportunity for development. These young men and women of Culver Military Academy and the Culver Academy for Girls are a vital part of America's future, and I am proud of the gesture of patriotism which they are making.

All of Indiana's Congressmen and Senators join me in saluting Culver Military Academy and the seventh inaugural appearance of its Black Horse Troop. A list of Indiana's Congressmen and Senators follows:

Ray J. Madden, John Brademas, Lee H. Hamilton, Roger H. Zion, Elwood Hillis, Vance Hartke.

William G. Bray, J. Edward Roush, John T. Myers, David W. Dennis, William Hudnut, Birch Bayh.

SENATE—Tuesday, January 16, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, JR., a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of justice and judgment, before whom the nations rise and fall, lead us in paths of righteousness and truth. May the silenced guns of yesterday be harbingers of universal peace for all the tomorrows. Redeem the nations from the ways of war to the ways of mutual trust and good will which prevents differences from becoming overt violence and destruction. To this end, we beseech Thee, to be with Thy servants in this place in their quest for peace at home and abroad. And may our love of Thee surpass all earthly loves.

Through Him who is Lord of truth and light and love. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., January 16, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, JR., a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSTON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSTON) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) extending the time within which the President may transmit the Budget Message and the Economic Report to the Congress and extending the time within which the Joint Economic Committee shall file its report, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 12, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Thursday next.